DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 717

LI 002 018

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | National Commission on Libraries and Information Science; Hearing before the Subcommittee on Education...on S.1519 to Establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and for Other Purposes. |
| INSTITUTION | Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Washington, D.C. |
| PUB DATE | 69 |
| NOTE | 63p. |
| EDRS PRICE | EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.25 |
| DESCRIPTORS | Federal Legislation, Financial Support, *Information Centers, *Information Needs, *Information Science, *Libraries, Library Science, National Libraries, National Programs, Planning Commissions, Policy Formation, Program Descriptions, *Use Studies |
| IDENTIFIERS | *National Commission on Libraries and Information |

ABSTRACT

Testimony relative to the establishment of a National Commission on Library and Information Science as a continuing Federal planning agency is presented in the form of verbatim oral question and answers, prepared statements, letters and supplemental materials. List of witnesses include: (1) Grant Venn, (2) L. Quincy Mumford, (3) William S. Dix, (4) Mrs. Merlin Moore and (5) Joseph Becker. The text of S. 1519 and a summary of objectives and recommendations are provided. Other documents on this same legislation are reported in LI 002 023, LI 002 024, and LI 002 025. (MF)

ED040717

# NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

## HEARING

BEFORE THE

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

OF THE

## COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

## UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-FIRST CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

## S. 1519

TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

APRIL 24, 1969

002018

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
29-067 WASHINGTON : 1969

ED 040417

## COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

RALPH YARBOROUGH, Texas, *Chairman*

JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., New Jersey
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin
WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota
THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri
ALAN CRANSTON, California
HAROLD E. HUGHES, Iowa

JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
WINSTON L. PROUTY, Vermont
PETER H. DOMINICK, Colorado
GEORGE MURPHY, California
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania
HENRY BELLMON, Oklahoma
WILLIAM B. SAXBE, Ohio

ROBERT O. HARRIS, *Staff Director*
JOHN S. FORSYTHE, *General Counsel*
ROY H. MILLENSON, *Minority Staff Director*
EUGENE MITTELMAN, *Minority Counsel*

---

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island, *Chairman*

RALPH YARBOROUGH, Texas
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., New Jersey
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota
THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri

WINSTON L. PROUTY, Vermont
JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
PETER H. DOMINICK, Colorado
GEORGE MURPHY, California
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania

STEPHEN J. WEXLER, *Counsel*
RICHARD D. SMITH, *Associate Counsel*
ROY H. MILLENSON, *Minority Staff Member*



ED 040418

# CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Text of S. 1519 | 3 |
| Summary of objectives and recommendations | 2 |
| Departmental reports: | |
| Bureau of the Budget | 9 |
| Department of Agriculture | 8 |


## CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

### APRIL 24, 1969


| | |
|---|---|
| Venn, Grant, Associate Commissioner, Bureau of Adult, Vocational, and Library Programs, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; accompanied by Ray M. Fry, Director, Division of Library Programs, Bureau of Adult, Vocational, and Library Programs; Lee G. Burchinal, Director, Division of Information Technology and Dissemination, Bureau of Research; Scott Adams, Deputy Director, National Library of Medicine, National Institutes of Health; and Albert L. Alford, Assistant Commissioner for Legislation | 11 |
| Mumford, Dr. L. Quincy, Librarian of Congress | 19 |
| Dix, Dr. William S., librarian, Princeton University | 26 |
| Moore, Mrs. Merlin, supervisor, economic education, State Department of Education, Little Rock, Ark | 34 |
| Becker, Joseph, president, American Society for Information Science, Bethesda, Md | 41 |


## STATEMENTS


| | |
|---|---|
| Association of Research Libraries' Federal Relations Committee on the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, position statement | 54 |
| Becker, Joseph, president, American Society for Information Science, Bethesda, Md | 41 |
| Dix, Dr. William S., librarian, Princeton University | 26 |
| Moore, Mrs. Merlin, supervisor, economic education, State Department of Education, Little Rock, Ark | 34 |
| Mumford, Dr. L. Quincy, Librarian of Congress | 19 |
| Nixon, President Richard M., re National Library Week, prepared statement | |
| Venn, Grant, Associate Commissioner, Bureau of Adult, Vocational, and Library Programs, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; accompanied by Ray M. Fry, Director, Division of Library Programs, Bureau of Adult, Vocational, and Library Programs; Lee G. Burchinal, Director, Division of Information Technology and Dissemination, Bureau of Research; Scott Adams, Deputy Director, National Library of Medicine, National Institutes of Health; and Albert L. Alford, Assistant Commissioner for Legislation | 11 |
| Young, Virginia G., president, American Library Trustee Association, prepared statement | 47 |


## ADDITIONAL INFORMATION


| | |
|---|---|
| Articles, publications, etc., entitled— | |
| "Summary of Objectives and Recommendations," by the National Advisory Commission on Libraries | 2 |
| " '1776' Reaps Fruit of Long Research," by Lewis Funke, from the New York Times, March 18, 1969 | 57 |
| " '76' Victory Confirmed by Sales at Box Office" | 59 |

Communications to—
Agnew, Hon. Spiro T., Vice President, from Anne H. Hoyt, secretary, Oklahoma Library Association, May 10, 1969 — Page 59
Pell, Hon. Claiborne, a U.S. Senator from the State of Rhode Island, from—
Bryant, Douglas W., president, Association of Research Libraries, April 30, 1969 — 48
Knight, Douglas M., president, Duke University, Durham, N.C., April 25, 1969 — 47
McCarthy, Stephen A., executive director, Association of Research Libraries, April 22, 1969, with attachment — 51
Morse, John F., director, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., May 2, 1969 — 49
Myer, Elizabeth G., director, Department of State Library Service, Providence, R.I., April 22, 1969 — 46
Yarborough, Hon. Ralph W., a U.S. Senator from the State of Texas, from—
Knox, William T., Information Industry Association, Washington, D.C., May 2, 1969 — 50
Lacy, Dan, senior vice president McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, N.Y., May 6, 1969 — 49
Membership list—Association of Research Libraries, April 1969 — 55
National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, prepared statement — 52
Resolutions re S. 1519, adopted by—
ALA Council, the governing body of the American Library Association — 26
Board of Trustees of the Free Library of Philadelphia — 27
Mountain-Plains Library Association — 27

# NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

**THURSDAY, APRIL 24, 1969**

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
*Washington, D.C.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in room 4232, New Senate Office Building, Senator Claiborne Pell (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Yarborough, Pell (presiding), Randolph, and Schweiker.

Committee staff present: Robert O. Harris, staff director to full committee; Stephen J. Wexler, subcommittee counsel; Richard D. Smith, associate subcommittee counsel; and Roy H. Millenson, subcommittee minority staff.

Senator PELL. The hearing of the Education Subcommittee on S. 1519 will come to order.

I welcome each of you here today, and I hope that our hearing will produce a record on library science which will be useful in years to come.

The hearings today are the direct outgrowth of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries established in 1966 and charged with the responsibility of thoroughly studying the library field. The National Commission looked into areas such as: The role of libraries, public and private; the effective utilization of libraries; library fundings; and finally, making recommendations for action both public and private which would insure a viable library system for our country.

The National Advisory Commission on Libraries thoroughly explored its jurisdictional area, hearing witnesses, consulting with a variety of persons both public and private, and most importantly, working with the ultimate beneficiary, the end user, the library user. Nor was this effort limited to the Washington area, for 12 regional hearings were held around the country to supplement that material already amassed.

The Commission transmitted its report to the President on July 1, 1968. Well written and replete with foundation for its findings, it has become something akin to a bible for those in the library field. Perhaps it would be well to review the objectives and recommendations of the Commission at this point.

(A document entitled "Summary of Objectives and Recommendations" follows:)

SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The fundamental recommendation of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, on which further recommendations are based, is that it be declared National Policy, enunciated by the President and enacted into law by the Congress, that the American people should be provided with library and informational services adequate to their needs, and that the Federal Government, in collaboration with State and local governments and private agencies, should exercise leadership assuring the provision of such services.

OBJECTIVES FOR OVERCOMING CURRENT INADEQUACIES

Provide adequate library and information services for formal education at all levels.

Provide adequate library and informational services for the public at large.

Provide materials to support research in all fields at all levels.

Provide adequate bibliographic access to the nation's research and informational resources.

Provide adequate physical access to required materials or their texts throughout the nation.

Provide adequate trained personnel for the varied and changing demands of librarianship.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACHIEVING THE OBJECTIVES

1. Establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as a continuing Federal planning agency.

2. Recognition and strengthening of the role of The Library of Congress as the National Library of the United States and establishment of a Board of Advisers.

3. Establishment of a Federal Institute of Library and Information Science as a principal center for basic and applied research in all relevant areas.

4. Recognition and full acceptance of the critically important role the United States Office of Education currently plays in meeting needs for library services.

5. Strengthening State library agencies to overcome deficiencies in fulfilling their current functions.

Senator PELL. It should be noted that the first recommendation of the Commission was the establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. It was this in mind that the chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Honorable Ralph W. Yarborough of Texas, introduced S. 1519, which would establish such a National Commission.

(The bill S. 1519 and departmental reports follow:)

91ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1519

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 12 (legislative day, MARCH 7), 1969

Mr. YARBOROUGH introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

# A BILL

To establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That this Act may be cited as the "National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Act".

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby affirms that library and information services adequate to meet the needs of the people of the United States are essential to achieve national goals and to utilize most effectively the Nation's educational resources and that the Federal Government will cooperate with State and local governments and public and private agencies in assuring optimum provision of such services.

SEC. 3. There is hereby established, as an independent agency within the executive branch, a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

SEC. 4. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shall provide the Commission with necessary administrative services (including those related to budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement) for which payment shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement, from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Commission and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

FUNCTIONS

SEC. 5. (a) The Commission shall have the primary responsibility for developing plans for, and advising the appropriate governments and agencies on, the policy set forth in section 2. In carrying out that responsibility, the Commission shall—

(1) advise the President and the Congress on the implementation of national policy by such statements, presentations, and reports as it deems appropriate;

(2) conduct studies, surveys, and analyses of the library and informational needs of the Nation and the means by which these needs may be met through information centers, through the libraries of elementary and

secondary schools, and institutions of higher education, and through public, research, special, and other types of libraries;

(3) evaluate the effectiveness of library and information science programs and disseminate the results thereof;

(4) develop overall plans for meeting national library and informational needs and for the coordination of activities at the Federal, State, and local levels taking into consideration all of the library and informational resources of the Nation to meet those needs;

(5) provide technical assistance and advice to Federal, State, local, and private agencies regarding library and information sciences;

(6) promote research and development activities which will extend and improve the Nation's library and information-handling capability as essential links in the national communications networks; and

(7) submit to the President and the Congress (not later than January 1 of each year), a report on its activities during the preceding fiscal year.

(b) The Commission is authorized to contract with Federal agencies and other public and private agencies to carry out any of its functions under subsection (a) and to publish

29-067—69——2

and disseminate such reports, findings, studies, and records as it deems appropriate.

(c) The Commission is further authorized to conduct such hearings at such times and places as it deems appropriate for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

(d) The heads of all Federal agencies are, to the extent not prohibited by law, directed to cooperate with the Commission in carrying out the purposes of this Act.

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission shall be composed of fifteen members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than five members of the Commission shall be professional librarians or information specialists, and the remainder shall be persons having special competence or interest in the needs of our society for library and information services. One of the members of the Commission shall be designated by the President as Chairman of the Commission. The terms of office of members of the Commission shall be five years, except that (1) the terms of office of the members first appointed shall commence on the date of enactment of this Act and shall expire three at the end of one year, three at the end of two years, three at the end of three years, three at the end of four years, and three at the end of five years, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, and

(2) a member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term.

(b) Members of the Commission who are not in the regular full-time employ of the United States shall, while attending meetings or conferences of the Commission or otherwise engaged in the business of the Commission, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding the rate specified at the time of such service for grade GS–18 in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, including traveltime, and while so serving on the business of the Commission away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, and authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons employed intermittently in the Government service.

(c) (1) The Commission is authorized to appoint, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, covering appointments in the competitive service, such professional and technical personnel as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its function under this Act.

(2) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as

amended, temporary and intermittent services of such personnel as are necessary to the extent authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, but at rates not to exceed $100 per day (or, if higher, the rate specified at the time of such service for grade GS–18 in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code), including traveltime, and while so serving on the business of the Commission away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons employed intermittently in the Government service.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for each succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be appropriated by the Congress for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
*Washington, D.C., April 25, 1969.*

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
*Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,*
*U. S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your requests for reports on S. 1146 and S. 1519, bills to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

This Department favors the objective of the proposed legislation.

These bills provide for the establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science to assure provision of libary and information services adequate to the needs of the American people, to assure cooperation with State and local governments and private agencies to improve such services; and to strengthen Federal programs and policies relating to library and information services by a continuing process of review and evalution.

Because of the continuing increase in the literature and the varying requirements of our citizens, studies and analyses of user needs, appraisal of the adequacies and deficiencies in resources and services, and development of effective programs to meet these library needs are of particular importance.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

CLIFFORD M. HARDIN,
*Secretary of Agriculture.*

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
*Washington, D.C., April 29, 1969.*

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
*Chairman, Commitee on Labor and Public Welfare,*
*U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the views of the Bureau of the Budget on S. 1146, the "National Library Commission Act of 1969," and S. 1519, the "National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Act."

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has already testified on S. 1519 and has recommended that S. 1519 be reshaped to be similar to S. 1146. The Bureau of the Budget concurs generally in the testimony presented by HEW.

Accordingly, the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to enactment of a bill along the lines of S. 1146.

Sincerely yours,

WILFRED H. ROMMEL,
*Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.*

Senator PELL. The proposed National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Act would—

(1) Affirm that library and information sciences are essential to achieve national goals, and to fully utilize the Nation's educational resources effectively; and that the Federal Government will cooperate, with State and local governments, and with public and private libraries, in assuring optimum provision of library and information services; and

(2) Establish, as an independent agency, a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science which would advise the Federal, State and local governments on meeting the national policy with respect to library and information sciences.

The Commission would be provided administrative services by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The 15 members of the Commission would be appointed by the President with the advise and consent of the Senate. It would advise the President and the Congress on the implementation of national library policy; conduct surveys, analyses, and evaluations of library needed and programs; develop plans for meeting national library needs and for conducting governmental activities to meet those needs; provide technical assistance to governmental and private agencies; and promote research and development activities.

The bill would authorize $500,000 to be appropriated in fiscal year 1970; thereafter, there will be a permanent open-ended authorization of appropriation.

The bill is, to my mind, an excellent one, and will now be considered for discussion by the various witnesses who will be coming forward.

The first witness scheduled is Mr. Grant Venn.

Before he commences, however, I would hope that the sponsor of the bill, the chairman of this committee, might have some thoughts or good advice.

Senator YARBOROUGH. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the chairman of the Education Subcommittee for his diligence in promptly setting a bearing on this bill. That exceptional diligence and promptness is so characteristic of this distinguished Senator for Rhode Island, with whom we are privileged to serve on this committee.

Mr. Chairman, on September 2, 1966, by Executive order, there was established the National Advisory Commission on Libraries. It was charged with four tasks: (1) To make a comprehensive study and ap-

praisal of the role of libraries as resources for scholarly pursuits, centers for the dissemination of knowledge, and as components of the evolving national information system; (2) to appraise the policies, programs, and practices of public agencies and private institutions and organizations together with those factors which have a bearing on the role and effective utilization of libraries; (3) to appraise library funding through the Federal support of libraries to determine how funds available for the construction and support of libraries and library services can be more effectively and efficiently utilized; (4) to develop recommendations for action by government or private institutions and organizations designed to insure an effective and efficient library system for the Nation.

At one of the regional meetings held by the Advisory Commission over the country, 47 people from my home State of Texas testified before the Commission. In its report of July 1, 1968, carrying out the mandate of that Executive order, the Commission made its first recommendation, and I quote from it:

> **1. Establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as a continuing Federal planning agency.**

That is the first recommendation.

Now, in support of the recommendation, the Commission explained that in furthering library services "The most important single measure that can be undertaken is the establishment of the continuing Federal planning agency."

This bill, S. 1519, was introduced by me on March 12 to carry out that recommendation. We have a number of cosponsors for it. I think the need is self-evident. The budget amendment submitted by President Nixon cut back the funding for purchases of books and materials under the Library Services and Construction Act from $35 million to $17.5 million, although $75 million was authorized. I think the authorization of $75 million was modest.

The Johnson budget of January cut more than half of it and cut it down to $35 million.

The Nixon budget has now cut that in two again to $17.5 million. That is tokenism in the purchase of study books and materials and for construction.

This Nixon administration budget amendment cut $1.9 million from construction, eliminating this program.

In its accompanying statement it declares:

> **In line with our general policy to defer new construction starts in tightening the budget, this budget will eliminate funds for about 90 library construction projects from the 1970 budget.**

That is an interesting statement. I serve on the Military Construction Subcommittee, and we get more requests, for hundreds of millions more, for new construction for South Vietnam every year. I went over there last November. We have no agreement with South Vietnam as to what will happen, what is going to become of that property over there. And we want to appropriate a bare $1.9 million for construction in this country for libraries; for books. If we had a few more libraries and books, it might help settle that war over there.

Tuesday, the New York Times editorialized on the proclaiming of National Library Week. It said:

The original 1970 budget request for major library programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Act, the Library Services Construction Act amounted to $134,500,000. The revised budget cuts this down to a trifle over $46,000,000.—

And they might have said, "cut it down to a trifle"—

Equipment and construction materials for schools, public and academic libraries will be reduced or terminated altogether.

That is why I say the need for a continuing Commission planning agency for financial resources, to focus attention to the needs, for financial support of libraries, is self-evident.

The devastating effect of the budget recommendations is to cut down on reading books, and we will all get us a gun.

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the time the chairman is taking for this hearing and for his support, cosponsorship and aid to this bill.

Senator PELL. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

We will now hear from Mr. Grant Venn, the Associate Commissioner for Adult, Vocational, and Library Programs, Office of Education.

You might care to introduce your associates who are with you.

I have been over your statement, which is relatively short. You may want to give it in full, or you can digest it, as you see fit. In any event, we will be very interested in your comments.

Mr. VENN. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Senator Yarborough.

I would like to introduce the people with me. On my left is Mr. Scott Adams, Deputy Director, National Institutes of Health; next to me on my left is Mr. Ray Fry, Director, Division of Library Services and Educational Facilities. On my right is Mr. Lee Burchinal, Director, Division of Information Technology and Dissemination, Bureau of Research, and on my immediate right is Mr. Albert Alford, Assistant Comissioner for Legislation.

With your permission, I would like to read my statement, since it is relatively short.

Senator PELL. Yes. You may proceed in whatever manner you desire.

**STATEMENT OF GRANT VENN, ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER FOR ADULT, VOCATIONAL, AND LIBRARY PROGRAMS, OFFICE OF EDUCATION, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE; ACCOMPANIED BY RAY M. FRY, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF LIBRARY PROGRAMS, BUREAU OF ADULT, VOCATIONAL, AND LIBRARY PROGRAMS; LEE G. BURCHINAL, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND DISSEMINATION, BUREAU OF RESEARCH; SCOTT ADAMS, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE, NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH, AND ALBERT L. ALFORD, ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR LEGISLATION**

Mr. VENN. I am pleased to appear today to testify on S. 1519, a bill to create a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

We feel that the proposed National Commission could, in many helpful ways, alleviate difficulties of libraries across the country. As it now stands, the bill would establish a National Commission carrying

out several broad functions: advisory, planning and evaluation, and operational. On the whole, these are broader roles than can be accomplished. For reasons which I shall delineate, we would hope that in operation, the Commission would assume an advisory and coordinating role. Consistent with this, we are recommending a number of changes in the bill which we believe will help accomplish improved library services to the Nation.

First of all, I think it should be noted that a number of the Commission's functions proposed in S. 1519 are already being carried out by a wide range of Federal powers related to library and information needs. For example, the Commission would be directed to "promote research and development activities." It is not clear how the Commission could promote such activities without the resources to make contracts in support of research and development.

The difficulty in expecting this Commission to carry out research activities is illustrated by an example of the cost of research studies. Recently, the Office of Education contributed to a research project designed to evaluate the utility of book and media examination centers for school librarians and school faculties. The first phase of this multiphase project is costing a total of $291,637 of which the Office of Education is providing $227,767—slightly less than one-half of the appropriation authorized for the Commission's fiscal year 1970 operations.

However, even if the Commission had the resources, we wonder if it might not represent another layer on top of existing research and development activities undertaken by the Office of Education, the National Library of Medicine, the National Science Foundation, and other Federal agencies. Such research and development is also supported by State governments and by private foundations.

Perhaps a more effective role for the Commission would be to make recommendations on coordinating current research efforts at the Federal, State, and local levels. Since research efforts are now conducted at all levels, a national coordination effort is necessary. Promoting research, if that is to mean giving grants and contracts, would appear to be beyond the Commission's scope, and could mean a duplication of authorities already in existence.

It should be noted, too, that the Commission's planning function may be a duplication of activities now being carried out in the operation of various Federal library programs. For example, Congress has already given a planning mandate to the Office of Education for its basic mission of promoting "the cause of education," which assuredly includes libraries. In addition, the conduct of studies and surveys, evaluation of programs, development of planning units, and provision of technical assistance are presently a part of the responsibilities of programs administered by the Office of Education and of the administration of major libraries supported entirely by the Federal Government, such as the Library of Congress and the National Library of Medicine. In addition, most executive agencies with major responsibilities for the support of libraries or information science have provided for planning components.

Limited funds have sometimes—I might say very often—restricted the abilities of all agencies involved to fully carry out these functions. In addition, there are surely gaps in planning for the use of Federal, State, and local library and information resources that should be iden-

tified and filled. Pointing out where those gaps are and advising on how they might be eliminated would be important functions we would like to see the Commission perform.

We are aware that some supporters of this bill view the Commission as a national planning agency, and we do not share this view. We do feel, however, that there is a significant need for a body that could study and recommend methods for the coordination of the planning now going on at all levels of government. To conceive of this Commission as an agency which would attempt to develop overall plans for Federal, State, and local agencies and for public and private libraries and information centers seems somewhat inconsistent with planning functions already mandated by governments at all levels. The questions of conflicting authorities which should be considered are serious ones. It is possible that a national plan for State and local agencies might conflict with statewide planning efforts and local desires, thereby arousing fears of Federal control in an area where State and local authority must constitutionally be protected.

Fundamentally, however, we suspect that as a national planning agency, the Commission would simply be a less effective way to solve the problem. First, a national planning effort would be a staggering task, beyond the capacity of a Commission with members serving part time, limited staff, and limited resources. The cost of a sample planning effort is illustrative; the National Library of Medicine is currently supporting a planning project for a national biomedical comunication system at a cost of $835,000 for this year only. The Commission would not have the capacity to support the development of specific plans such as this one, much less national plans for all types of libraries and information systems.

The National Advisory Commission on Libraries was created under a mandate to—

> Appraise the role and adequacies of our libraries, now and in the future, as sources for scholarly research, as centers for the distribution of knowledge, and as links in our nation's rapidly evolving communications network.

After 2 years of work at a cost of $406,786, the Commission made six general recommendations, a major one being the establishment of the Commission proposed here. The experience of that Commission indicates that some kind of a permanent Commission is needed, but it should also indicate that such a Commission cannot be expected to be operational in nature.

We are concerned, then, that some of the responsibilities proposed for the Commission would prove to be beyond its powers to implement, and might conflict with or duplicate responsibilities presently vested in existing Federal, State, and local agencies. We feel that the Commission would be most effective as a coordinating and advisory body. Of all the categories of responsibilities assigned by this bill to the proposed Commission, only the advisory and coordinating responsibilities for the total national effort of support to libraries and information science are not clearly provided for by existing authorities. There are a number of existing library boards for single programs, such as the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine in the Federal sphere. These would continue to provide special advisory services for particular programs. In the area of examining the total national library program, the National Commission would provide a mech-

anism to advise the President and Congress on policy questions affecting libraries and to work with agencies involved in library and information science support to promote greater coordination in planning and research.

While stating our ideas about how the proposed Commission might be most useful in helping to meet the Nation's library and information science needs, we would like to suggest that the very independence of the Commission as it is proposed here may make more difficult the Commission's ability to advise on and coordinate the manner in which library support resources are spent. The bill provides for an independent agency linked only for administrative purposes to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, where Federal programs for library support are concentrated. Since the Commission would have no substantive relationship to HEW or any other Government agency, its advice and recommendations might not be closely and productively related to the manner in which funds will actually be spent. We, therefore, recommend that the Commission be established in HEW, since the largest concentration of library service programs is vested in that Department. This suggestion was made by the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, and we think it a wise one. We also recommend that three representatives from Federal agencies carry on library and information science activities should be appointed to the Commission as additional members. Including representatives of these agencies in the work of the Commission as members would insure that the views of the agencies responsible for Federal library and information science efforts would be considered, and that the agencies would be in a better position to implement the Commission's recommendations.

We would like to add one other suggestion regarding the Commission's composition. It would be useful for the Congress to spell out the criteria for the Commission's membership more specifically. We would recommend that the Commission's membership be more clearly defined to include persons representative of various areas of knowledge related to, but not strictly within, the field of libraries and information science, such as persons knowledgeable of technological advances in the field of information retrieval; specially concerned with the needs of the culturally and educationally deprived; persons responsible for the administration of a school or university; and knowledgeable of various aspects of the field of communication.

In conclusion, we support the concept of a National Commission on Library and Information Science as an advisory body, although we do have reservations about the way it is designed in S. 1519. We feel that its broad functions would prove to be beyond any Commission's working capacity, and that the Commission's work would most productively be focused on functions that are not now being performed by agencies administering library programs; that is, advisory and coordinating responsibilities directly related to implementation of programs.

We believe that the National Commission must be clearly defined as an advisory commission. In contrast to other advisory councils, such as the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, the National Commission's role, as presently defined in S. 1519, is ambiguous. We would be happy to work with the committee or Commission staff at your pleasure in developing further the recom-

mendations made above. We would far rather see a Commission effectively playing a more specifically advisory and coordinating role than assuming responsibilities which cannot be effectively carried out. All of our recommendations are made in this light, and we thank you for the opportunity to present the Department's views in this important area.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator PELL. Thank you very much. I would like to defer my questions or comments to the chairman of the full committee, the principal sponsor of the legislation, Senator Yarborough.

Senator YARBOROUGH. Well, Mr. Venn, I am rather puzzled by your statement, as I read it. It seems to me the essence of it is that we do not need the bill, but if it is passed, the bill is too weak to do the job that ought to be done.

Now, if it is too weak to do the job that ought to be done, maybe we ought to strengthen the bill.

Mr. VENN. Well, sir——

Senator YARBOROUGH. Of course, if this is not needed, and we already have all of the other Federal and State coordination, and this would just be on top of all of the other, then it seems to me that you are running throughout these six pages a basic inconsistency.

Mr. VENN. Sir, I believe that the Department definitely recognizes that there are real gaps among the Federal agencies as well as the State and local agencies responsible for library development and information science. We do recognize the need for an overall look at these various functions and recommendations which would fill these gaps, and this would be assigned, we presume, to the operating units to carry out. So, this is an area where we fully recognize the need, and we do think that the Commission would have a very salutary effect on improving the library services of the Nation.

Senator YARBOROUGH. I have been a member of this Education Subcommittee of the Senate for more than 11 years. During that time I have studied each of the many library bills that have come before the Congress, and my opinion that this bill is needed is based not only on the recommendation of the Commission set up under the Executive order of 1966 but as a result of what I have learned as a member of this Education Subcommittee hearing the library bills and as a member of the Appropriations Committee hearing the presentations made by the Library of Congress. I have seen, unfortunately, often hostile reactions by some members on the Appropriations Committee to what I consider very modest requests by the Library of Congress, particularly in the area of translating foreign publications, making them available to American scholars, and in many other fields. I think we need such a Commission to strengthen the fight for libraries, for books, for people.

We read a lot in the press for the last several years about a choice between guns and butter, and now the President is finally saying that the guns are going out and there is going to be butter. I think that we ought to change it to say there is going to be guns, butter, and books. You know, you see, books have gone, they have gone down the drain here in this recommendation from the Bureau of the Budget. The January budget cut the authorized $75 million to $35 million, and, then, the April budget—that which should have been handed in April 1—cut it to $17.5 million.

Books are the first thing to go. So, I think that the creation of this National Commission—I have no pride in authorship, actually. The desire to support it is the main thing that I have got in this bill. We have gotten advice from different sources on it, and draftsmanship from different sources, so I would ask the staff to work with us, and ask the aid of this able chairman, who is not only the chairman but a scholar. He has worked in the past and considered every proposed amendment to strengthen this act in every way that we can. I think that we need the strength and support for libraries. I would say to the committee that I agree with your statement about the amount of money, realizing that it is difficult to get money even for butter. I think $500,000 is too modest. I think we ought to consider all of these amendments and raise that amount. I thought that would be starting money and would be increased over the years. We can increase that later, if we cannot get more the first year.

But we will accept your offer to work with the committee or the committee staff on the bill, not that I would be willing to cut it to a mere advisory council to sit here and write letters. I think I envision this Commission as a motivating force to draw together many things, and, above all to draw together support for libraries of the country.

I recall when we were considering libraries in the schools acts, at that time in the public elementary schools in America, when we first considered that act, 66 percent, I believe it was, of all of the public elementary schools in America had no libraries. Eighty percent of all of the elementary schools in the American public elementary school system had no library and no trained librarian. We have made some progress since then under these acts, but I think that more needs to be done.

I have some specific questions, but I will yield this back to the chairman, and my colleagues.

Senator PELL. Thank you. Do you have any specific language changes that you would like to submit to us at this time for the record? I think it would not be a bad idea for them to be submitted, then on an informal level the subcommittee staff and your office might get together on mutually agreeable language. My own view is very much along the lines of the chairman. I would like to see a strong bill in this regard. I think more needs to be done, not less. However since I also want to see a bill passed, I would like to work together with the Administration on this.

A couple of points here:

Does not your statement or your testimony really relate to the degree of involvement as opposed to the advisability of whether or not to pass the legislation?

Mr. VENN. Yes, I think it does, Mr. Chairman.

Senator PELL. Good. Now, you say that the Commission's planning function may be a duplication of services that the Office of Education already has for the basic mission of promoting "the cause of education." This is rather a generic term somewhat like the public welfare clause in the Constitution, but aren't you really using somewhat vague language in order to buttress your case? Because under the same logic we could repeal NDEA, ESEA, and all of the higher education bills, and then just give a nice big block grant to the Office of Education to "promote the cause of education" and accomplish

the same end. Following this through to its final conclusion, the Congress could just abdicate its total responsibility. I wonder if you really meant that we should just try to turn the money over to you and leave you to make judgment as to what best serves the cause of education.

Mr. VENN. No, sir. I think we were trying to differentiate between the planning function and the operational and implementation functions. We do recognize, Mr. Chairman, that there are real gaps between the planning, between the research and the implementation of these programs by the various agencies. We think an overall group like the Commission can look independently and objectively at the whole spectrum of library needs and problems. It would make suggestions that would increase the efficiency of the agencies involved and we hope close those existing gaps. We need suggestions and recommendations to identify the gaps and to improve the efforts and activities of the operating agencies.

Senator PELL. Thank you.

Senator Schweiker, do you have any questions?

Senator SCHWEIKER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have one question I would like to ask.

Section 7 of the bill provides for an authorization of $500,000 for fiscal year 1970. That leaves the amount open without a limit for subsequent fiscal years. Should the committee decide to stipulate a specific amount for subsequent years, would you have any recommendation or any feelings about what subsequent authorization limits might be?

Mr. VENN. No, sir, Senator Schweiker, we would not.

I think that our testimony indicates that we would prefer the advisory coordinating role. The amount, of course, is written in the bill——

Senator SCHWEIKER. Do you have any projection about what that amount might be under your concept of the advisory coordinating role?

Mr. VENN. I would guess that the amount under the advisory coordinating role would be proper in terms of those goals, those limited goals.

Senator SCHWEIKER. I do want to ask, Mr. Chairman, if I might, at this point, offer in the record and insert a statement by President Nixon on National Library Week.

Senator PELL. It is so ordered.

(The statement referred to follows:)

Following is the complete text of the statement by President Nixon, launching the Twelfth Annual National Library Week, April 20 to 26 (1969).

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington.*

Libraries are the banks of our educational system. And they yield rich dividends in knowledge and in wisdom. They are a summing-up of past achievement and a stimulant to future progress.

Never have we had greater reason than this year to celebrate National Library Week. For never have our libraries played a more prominent role in our campaign against ignorance and for fullness of educational opportunity.

—Change is sweeping our academic institutions. Our libraries are sensitive to the currents, responsive to the tide.

—Modern technology is revolutionizing our system of public information. Our libraries, with new programs and new media techniques, have become exciting and effective centers of innovation.

—The need to bring the benefits of better education to those who have been bypassed by existing programs is more imperative than ever. By extending their services throughout the communities of America, our libraries immeasurably advance our goal, and perform the highest public good.

For these and all their selfless efforts to serve, I congratulate America's librarians—a dedicated profession of men and women who enrich their fellow citizens, their communities, and their country.

(Signed) RICHARD NIXON.

Senator PELL. Senator Yarborough?

Senator YARBOROUGH. Mr. Chairman, in view of the number of witnesses we have, four more now, I believe I will forego any further questions, although I might say that the statement, in all fairness, conflicts, with itself in many respects in, first, saying it is needed, and, then, saying it is too weak. But I think the statement largely is a self-revealing statement that I am glad to have, because I am for the bill.

Senator PELL. It reminds me of the statement last Monday, when the administration came up with four pages on why the National Media Center for the Handicapped bill should be passed but closed with two pages on why it should not. I think today's testimony is similar.

Senator YARBOROUGH. I have no further questions.

Senator RANDOLPH. I am sorry that I was unable to be here to hear your statement.

Have you completed it, Grant?

Mr. VENN. Yes, sir; I just completed my testimony.

Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, Grant Venn was in the West Virginia educational system for several years, and did an outstanding job of leadership in Wood County. I have not been here to hear his statement, and I have not had an opportunity to read it. I do not want to be repetitive, but I ask you, Grant, just this one question—regardless of what the statement indicates:

Are we short on library facilities today in our educational system, or are the library facilities adequate; and, if they are not adequate, what would you suggest to remedy that deficiency?

Mr. VENN. Well, there is no question but what they are not only short but inadequate, and the remedy is going to have to be additional facilities, additional materials, and additional services.

The major question has been the time and the situation. There is no question that we are short. Nearly all of our libraries are inadequate in terms of what the technology of our society and the times demand.

Senator RANDOLPH. Do you know, Grant, if there is a book in the library in the Parkersburg High School entitled "They Signed for Us"? Did you ever hear of the book?

Mr. VENN. No, sir, I have not.

Senator RANDOLPH. Well, it is a story of the 56 signers of the Declaration of Independence, and it is a human document, less than 100 pages. It should be in every high school library. We should be thinking in terms of the teaching of history and the reading of history with the individuals who made it, the human beings who did the job along the way, not just the mere statistics but the warm story, the meaningful story of such men.

I ask this question many times, and I find no such book, Mr. Chairman, in the libraries. I find history being taught without the story of the persons who made the history, and I think that is one reason today

that perhaps there is a lack of understanding and feeling toward American history by our youth.

John Hancock did not sign in big letters because he was pompous; he did it because he wanted his name to be seen, as he said, by His Majesty, the King, without the benefit of his glasses. All of this, you might say, is just a little touch on human nature, but when Charles Carroll of Carrollton, Md., signed, the man standing by said "There goes millions of dollars," and that was true. He lost every cent, and he was a multimillionaire at that time. When Stephen Hopkins came down from Rhode Island against the advice of his doctor and signed he said: "My hand trembles but my heart does not." And that is your State, Mr. Chairman.

The fascinating story is not so much that they signed, but what happened to these men.

One man had 11 children. All of them died during the year of the Revolution. This is the sort of material I would like to see in the history books, and I just point today to a little book, thin in number of pages but of great depth, "They Signed for Us."

Thank you.

Mr. VENN. I shall read that book before I see you again, Mr. Senator.

Senator RANDOLPH. Thank you very much.

Senator PELL. I think, along the same line, this is probably one of the reasons for the great success of the musical "1776," which is now playing. It has successfully humanized the signers of the Declaration.

Thank you very much, Mr. Venn, and your colleagues.

Our next witness is Dr. L. Quincy Mumford, the very able and competent Librarian of Congress.

Delighted to welcome you here, sir.

Senator YARBOROUGH. Mr. Chairman, while Dr. Mumford is coming up to the stand, I would like to announce that I have just received a request that Senator Murphy, of California, be added as a cosponsor of this bill, S. 1519—the library bill—to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and a request from Senator Schweiker, of Pennsylvania, which will be made of the Senate.

Senator PELL. Dr. Mumford, I have read your statement. It is short and excellent—a good one. You may wish to read it. Or you may proceed as you will.

Dr. MUMFORD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. Since it is brief, I would like to read it through.

## STATEMENT OF DR. L. QUINCY MUMFORD, LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

Dr. MUMFORD. First, I want to thank the committee for the opportunity of appearing here today to discuss S. 1519, a bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

I think that it is particularly fitting that our attention is directed to this bill today as, throughout the country, our fellow citizens are celebrating the 12th annual National Library Week, although, as Senator Yarborough has pointed out, the prospects of library funding at the moment are rather dismal.

I would also like to mention, Mr. Chairman, that this happens to be the birthday of the Library of Congress, the 169th year of its existence. It was on April 24, 1800, when the act was signed creating the Library of Congress.

As you know, in September 1966, the President appointed the National Advisory Commission on Libraries to study and appraise the role of libraries broadly as resources for scholarly pursuit, centers for the dissemination of knowledge, and components of the evolving national information systems. In addition, the Commission was to review policies, programs, and practices of Government agencies that have a bearing on the role of libraries and their effective utilization; to examine library funding; and to develop recommendations for action to insure an effective and efficient library system for the Nation.

One of the major recommendations of the Commission was that a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science be established on a continuing basis as a Federal planning agency. I was a member of the President's Committee which reviewed the recommendations of the Advisory Commission, and I strongly supported the recommendation for a continuing body to survey library and information needs and to advise public and private bodies as to how best they can be met.

Although libraries have, in the last decade, made great advances in cooperative library programs such as those authorized under title III (interlibrary cooperation) of the Library Services and Construction Act, title II–C (Library of Congress cooperative acquisitions and cataloging program) of the Higher Education Act, and title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, there is considerable evidence that libraries have not been able to serve the reading and information needs of all the people. Because of the complexities of our society, the growing need for quick, qualitative information by all segments of society has overburdened the library services of the Nation. This demand for service has come at the same time that libraries are faced with the problems of controlling vast amounts of information produced in a variety of forms. The only solution to meeting the needs of both libraries and of the public lies in cooperation based on coordinated national planning.

Also, librarians have recognized their dependency on new electronic technologies. As a result, there has been in many respects a union of the library and information science communities. Librarians are taking the systems approach to problem solving, and this approach is daily making apparent the interdependencies and common practices that underlie and sustain the library and information services that should be available to the people of the country.

In order to seek solutions to such vast national problems as education, health, urban development, law enforcement, social justice, and many more, the latest available data must be in the hands of those concerned with these problems. This, of necessity demands the pooling of all library and information resources, including those of the Federal complex, the private sector, the academic community, the cities. the States, and the regions.

It is for these reasons that the proposed National Commission on Libraries and Information Science should be established. Such a Commission—composed of distinguished and knowledgeable persons from

the various user groups, as well as some library and information-science specialists—would provide a central mechanism for examining current programs, identifying gaps, suggesting ways for eliminating those gaps, pointing to research and development that needs to be done, and, taking full advantage of planning being done by others but not usurping those legitimate planning functions. Thus, a truly national information system could be developed to meet the needs of the times. This Commission, in short, would be able to undertake the overall, long-range planning that is needed.

We now know that the Federal, State, private, and local library and information programs have mutually dependent interests. Coordination across the barriers of geography, governmental subdivision, and other restrictive factors is essential if we are to have satisfactory library and information services. This would be coordination, not through the Commission's having administrative authority over any other agency or enterprise, but through the power to gather information, to have studies made, and to plan in the national interest. Such a national commission, adequately staffed, with the responsibility for making independent recommendations to the President and to the Congress, would provide, in my opinion, the leadership and impetus necessary to reach our desired goals. Such a commission should be able to provide the mutual ground where all elements of the library and information-science community would have a voice, and, as a result, a coordinated national library and information system—capable of meeting our growing needs in this area—would emerge.

Mr. Chairman, I have suggested an amendment to this bill which your staff has; namely, to make a provision that the Commission may accept grants, gifts, or bequests of money in furtherance of the functions of the Commission. As you know, this is somewhat typical of commissions or other bodies that have been created in recent years to give them more flexibility and to supplement approriated funds when necessary. I would recommend that the bill be amended to include such a provision.

Senator PELL. Thank you, Dr. Mumford. It might be interesting to note the fortunate coincidence that we are holding hearings on this bill during National Library Week, and I must commend President Nixon's fine statement on the vital services that libraries provide. It is ironic, though, that the release of his eloquent message which cites libraries as the "bank" of the educational system was simultaneously accompanied by the Bureau of the Budget's elimination of all Federal funds for school libraries and crippling reductions in other similar programs.

As chairman of the national library assistance program in Rhode Island last year I was impressed by the progress being made toward closing school library book gaps and toward further library cooperation and coordination services.

Actually, National Library Week is not just a week but, in fact, a year-round effort—over the past 12 years—by thousands of private citizens around the country, working under the leadership of library professionals to improve all kinds of library services and to make possible the total access of information we all deserve.

29-067—69——4

I would hope that the President and the administration's commitment extended to funds as well as to the eloguent message that was released this week.

I will defer my own specific questions to the chairman of the full committee, whose bill we are now considering, Senator Yarborough.

Senator YARBOROUGH. Dr. Mumford, I want to congratulate you and thank you on this fine statement worthy of the Librarian of Congress, and, therefore, the Librarian of the United States. It is a very informed statement. We have heard your testimony before at the appropriations hearings over the years, pleading for funds to carry forward this faster dissemination of information, this electronic tieup that you describe here. I want to thank you, not merely as a Senator but as a citizen of the United States, for what you have done to advance learning, the science of learning, in this country through the means by which information is collected and disseminated among the people.

Dr. MUMFORD. Thank you very much, Senator.

Senator YARBOROUGH. I have read your recommended amendment. I accept it, as author of the bill, and direct the staff that, at the next printing, this amendment be printed as section 5—this proposed amendment—and that the provisions be renumbered accordingly.

Senator PELL. Senator Schweiker?

Senator SCHWEIKER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to commend Dr. Mumford, too, for a very fine statement.

I just wondered if he had any thoughts or suggestions about the fiscal question that I have asked the other witness; namely, about whether we should include an authorizing amount for subsequent years after the initial $500,000, and, if so, what level of funding, in your judgment, would be required?

Dr. MUMFORD. Senator, I do not have any precise ideas on that. I would expect that this initial amount would enable the Commission to get started, to acquire a staff, and to begin to work on some of the problems. But, obviously, $500,000 will not be sufficient in succeeding years. Whether it is better to leave this open for the Appropriations Committees to decide, or to specify some authorizing amount, I do not have a strong opinion on that, or how much would be required.

Senator SCHWEIKER. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Senator PELL. How, Dr. Mumford, would we go about expanding the role of the Library of Congress to make it the libraries' library? Do you see this as relating to the pending bill in any way?

Dr. MUMFORD. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think it is related to the role of the Library of Congress. I would expect the Commission to assist us in strengthening the role of the Library of Congress as the National Library of the United States and to help us to secure fuller recognition on the part of the Congress and the Nation at large, that it is, in effect, the national library. Specifically, I would hope that the Commission could assist the Library and the Congress in providing adequate funding to carry out all the functions appropriate to a national library.

Senator PELL. Could you see giving it shelter in your building?

Dr. MUMFORD. "Shelter" is a word that may be a little difficult here, because of our great lack of space. The Commission could be attached to the Library of Congress for fiscal and administrative purposes. My own position on that is neutral. If the committee and the Congress

wish to have it attached to the Library of Congress, I certainly would not oppose it. I think it is something that should be discussed with the Joint Committee on the Library, of which you are a member, Mr. Chairman. Quarters for staff would probably have to be provided outside our present overcrowded buildings. At the moment, we would not have the space to accommodate the Commission's staff, but this might not be a serious obstacle.

Senator PELL. In brief, you are for the bill, as I understand it?

Dr. MUMFORD. Yes, indeed.

Senator PELL. Thank you.

Senator Randolph?

Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman. Dr. Mumford, the matter of shelter, the matter of space, is one that I have some knowledge of, as you know, in discussions with you and members of the James Madison Memorial Commission. We are faced with the fact that you have brought so forcefully to our attention of the cramped quarters, not only for the use by persons of the Library in research and study and reading, but also the necessary storage for documents which have special significance.

I have learned, Doctor, that there are some efforts being made to perhaps discontinue the Madison Commission. In fact, I had an inquiry in the last 3 days as to whether I thought the Commission should be continued.

This is perhaps not the place for you to discuss the work of that group, except to say that what we have attempted to do was not only to have an appropriate memorial for James Madison but perhaps even more important to your thinking would be that here in this memorial there would be the working quarters, the sinews of study and research and questing.

Would you just chat for a moment on the subject?

Dr. MUMFORD. Well, as I have pointed out to you and many others, Senator, it is inevitable that the Library of Congress will grow as does any research library—we are not alone in that. With the increase of publications in this country and throughout the world, and with the need for additional manpower to acquire, to catalog, to organize, and to service those materials, it was inevitable that we would need more space. I was very glad when we were able to have the active cooperation of the Madison Memorial Commission in creating a living memorial to President Madison in the form of a third Library of Congress building. As you know, it would contain a handsome memorial hall in which would be displayed documentary materials and artifacts relating to the contributions of Madison. I think this is a splendid but economical combination of efforts and purposes, and we are grateful for the interest and support of the Madison Memorial Commission in not only obtaining a memorial to Madison but in helping the Library further its existence by meeting its need for more space. We would have housed in the James Madison building all the manuscript collections of the Library of Congress, which include the papers of 23 Presidents, as well as the papers of Cabinet officers, political, military, business, and labor leaders, scientists, and literary people. We will also have other nonbook material located in that building. It will be a working building, of course, and will house many members of our staff, including the Legislative Reference Service. It will be a center for re-

search—particularly for anyone who wishes to study the life of Madison and other Founding Fathers and the period in which they lived.

Senator RANDOLPH. Well, I thank you for addressing your remarks to this point. I asked for them, just to reinforce, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, the need for the upgrading—if I use the word advisedly—of the Library's facilities and, of course, the memorialization in this instance of a former President of the United States. I think that Dr. Mumford—and I want to have the record reflect my expression, his efforts to bring our Library, or our libraries generally, to the highest level of usage, Mr. Chairman, has been an important contribution, and I think this is very, very important, and they must be made places of not so much cold, dark recesses but the open air, shall I say, approach with the sunlight moving in. The Doctor expresses this often to me, and I express it today, make that library a living instrument.

Dr. MUMFORD. Yes, sir.

Senator RANDOLPH. Thank you.

Dr. MUMFORD. I would like to emphasize that the Library of Congress is not just a storehouse of material, but, as you were saying, it is a lively organization, a complex of services that are used by thousands, even millions of people. It is a living, vital operation and a unique national resource.

Senator RANDOLPH. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator PELL. Senator Yarborough.

Senator YARBOROUGH. Dr. Mumford, in your statement, you say that for these reasons the proposed National Commission on Libraries and Information Science should be established and that such a Commission should be composed of distinguished and knowledgeable persons from the various user groups as well as some library and professional science specialists, and then you define what they could do.

Now, the bill provides for a Commission of 15 members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and that not more than five members of the Commission shall be professional librarians or information specialists, and the remainder shall be persons having special competence or interests in the needs of our society for library and information services. I come now to the question: Mr. Venn recommended that the bill spell out that there be required three representatives from Federal agencies carrying on library and information science activity. They should be appointed in addition to the 15. Including representatives from government in the work of the Commission, as members, would insure that the views of agencies responsible for Federal library services, he said, would be heard.

Then, the Government witness from HEW further recommend, that the Commission membership be more clearly defined to include representatives of various areas of knowledge related to but not strictly within the field of libraries and information science. The bill requires persons having special competence in the interest and needs of our society for library and information science to be appointed, and HEW recommends that they not be within the field of library and information science, such as persons knowledgeable of technological advances in the field of information retrieval—in one category. Two, specially concerned with the needs of the culturally and educationally de-

prived; three, responsible for the administration of a school and university; four, knowledgeable of various aspects in the field of communications.

Do you think that the bill ought to be amended to spell out all of these categories—university administrator; somebody in the field of communications—apparently, and that we should take these 15 and categorize all the qualifications?

Dr. MUMFORD. Well, I would doubt, Senator, that it need be spelled out to that extent. I think it certainly should have representation of outstanding librarians and information specialists. It should have people who are conscious of, and sensitive to, the role of libraries in our society, persons who are sincerely interested in trying to bring better services to the people and in making information more readily available to them.

I would not agree with his proposal that it include representatives from present Federal agencies. It seems to me that for this Commission to operate more effectively it should be divorced from the operational programs. It should not get drawn into the day-to-day management of present on-going programs, but it should relate its work generally to those programs and consider them in the general concept of coordination and planning. I would not advocate that we have specified representatives from different departments in the Government.

Senator YARBOROUGH. Thank you.

Now, I think that your statement spells out what I envision this Commission doing, and I want to congratulate you for that same statement.

I want to mention another point in your statement where you say:

**Because of the complexities of our society and the growing need for quick, qualitative information from all segments of the Society, this need has overburdened the library services of the nation.**

That reminds me of what the president of the Encyclopaedia Britannica said just a few years ago, testifying before our committee in this room. He said they are rewriting the Encyclopaedia Britannica, and because of the explosion of learning and knowledge in this country, the greatest explosion of learning and knowledge, he said, in the history of mankind, of the 37 million to 38 million words in the Encyclopaedia Britannica they are having to change 10 million of those words to describe the things in the language that people today are learning. This explosion of learning and knowledge, as you have summarized it and boiled it down as one of the great needs for this Commission.

Thank you for this contribution.

Senator PELL. Thank you very much, Dr. Mumford.

Dr. MUMFORD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee.

Senator YARBOROUGH. I sympathize with you when you come before our Appropriations Committee asking for the money. I support you.

Dr. MUMFORD. Thank you very much, Senator. We certainly need that third building very badly.

Senator PELL. Our next witness is William Dix, librarian of Princeton University, who has received a bachelor's, a master's, and a doctor's degree from that very fine educational institution, and I take particular pleasure, as a graduate of Princeton, in welcoming you here.

I have read your statement. It is short and excellent. Proceed, as you will.

Mr. Dix. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I might add, in view of your gracious introduction, that the long interest in books and libraries which you have demonstrated and which your father demonstrated before you, makes it particularly appropriate for you to be conducting these hearings.

Senator Pell. Thank you.

## STATEMENT OF WILLIAM S. DIX, LIBRARIAN, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Mr. Dix. My name is William S. Dix, librarian of Princeton University and also at present the president-elect of the American Library Association, which I am representing today. This nonprofit educational organization has a membership of over 40,000 and is dedicated to improving library service to the people through school, college, university, research, government, and public libraries.

I represent also the Association of Research Libraries, of which I am a former president. The 80 institutional members of this organization include the major university libraries, the three great national libraries of the Federal Government, and a few other libraries offering broad support to advanced education and the advancement of learning.

These organizations have stated their unequivocal approval of S. 1519, a bill to establish a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. The establishing of such a commission was the first recommendation of the temporary National Advisory Commission on Libraries created by Executive order on September 2, 1966. Its report, submitted to the President in October 1968, has been endorsed by the American Library Association and other groups. I ask your permission to submit their official resolutions for the record, Mr. Chairman, and I will give them to the clerk.

Senator Pell. It will be done.

(The resolutions follow:)

### Resolution Adopted by the ALA Council, The Governing Body of the American Library Association

Whereas the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries is the result of comprehensive study into the current status and future needs of the Nation's libraries and of extensive citizen hearings; and,

Whereas the Commission's Report, received by the President of the United States October 15, 1968, is the most far-reaching statement of library needs and goals ever enunciated by an official body of the Federal Government; and

Whereas this document presents a perceptive appraisal of the immediate and future requirements of all types of libraries to enable them to serve more effectively as vital, relevant institutions for all the people, and proposes responsible and realistic objectives to overcome current inadequacies and develop library services to their full potential; and

Whereas the National Advisory Commission on Libraries has recommended "That it be declared National Policy that the American people should be provided with library and information services adequate to their needs, and that the Federal Government, in collaboration with State and local governments and private agencies, should exercise leadership in assuring the provision of such services"; and

Whereas the necessity for coordinated, long-range planning and evaluation to determine feasible ways of meeting the new and growing demands of library users is widely recognized: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we, the Council of the American Library Association, do hereby endorse and support the statement of National Policy and the establishment by Congress of a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as a continuing Federal planning agency.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE FREE LIBRARY OF PHILADELPHIA SUPPORTING S. 1519

MARCH 25, 1969.

Hon. JOSHUA EILBERG,
*House of Representatives,*
*Longsworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SIR: The Board of Trustees of the Free Library of Philadelphia, at their last meeting, passed the following resolution:

Whereas bills H.R. 8839 and S. 1519 have been introduced into the House of Representatives and the Senate of the Congress of the United States respectively; and

Whereas these bills advocate the establishment of a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Sciences; and

Whereas the Board of Trustees of the Free Library of Philadelphia is in agreement with the establishment of such a Commission and the work with which it is charged: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Board of Trustees of the Free Library of Philadelphia will support bills H.R. 8839 and S. 1519 and request the Representatives of the Philadelphia Districts and the Senators of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to give their support to these bills.

This development is important to library service in Philadelphia. We hope that you will support bill H.R. 8839 and aid in its passage into national law.

Sincerely,

JAMES ALAN MONTGOMERY, Jr.,
*President, Board of Trustees,*

---

RESOLUTION TO SUPPORT RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES

(Adopted by the Mountain-Plains Library Association on November 16, 1968, for transmittal to the Committee on Legislation of the American Library Association)

Whereas the Mountain-Plains Library Association, comprising the States of Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming, is assembled in conference in Salt Lake City, Utah, to consider "The Challenge of Change to Mountain-Plains Libraries"; and

Whereas the Mountain-Plains Library Association has received the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries and found it highly commendable and worthy of implementation, inasmuch as it points out the historical highlights and structural necessities of library service and recommends responsible and realistic objectives to overcome current inadequacies and develop library and information services for the Nation's future needs; and

Whereas the Mountain-Plains Library Association has noted and found laudable the recognition of the criterion of social value that pervades every existing and conceivable library and information function: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we, the Mountain-Plains Library Association, do hereby endorse and support the recommendation of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries: That it be declared National Policy, enunciated by the President and enacted into law by the Congress that the American people should be provided with library and information services adequate to their needs, and that the Federal Government, in collaboration with State and local governments and private agencies, should exercise leadership in assuring the provision of such services; and finally, be it

*Resolved*, That the Mountain-Plains Library Association urges and supports the efforts of the Committee on Legislation of the American Library Association to work for implementation of the recommendations for achieving the objectives set forth in the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, particularly the establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as a continuing Federal planning agency.

Mr. DIX. The distinguished Presidential Advisory Commission conducted hearings in many parts of the country, heard a wide variety of witnesses, and had many special studies prepared for it. Its report emphasizes that library services adequate to meet the needs of the people is a national as well as a local responsibility and that to be effective it

must be developed nationally in a coordinated, not a haphazard, manner. It finds the creation of a permanent commission the first essential in insuring orderly progress toward their goal. The proposed legislation now before this committee would be the first step in implementing these proposals and could become a landmark in the educational and cultural development of this country. I shall try to explain why this is so.

Let us begin by reminding ourselves just what a library really is. Back in the dawn of time man began to communicate with other men when he learned to speak, and undoubtedly sometime before.

By these oral means he could transmit essential information—where the hunting was good or what enemies might be approaching.

When he developed the ability and the materials to write, he could transfer progressively more complex information further and further in space and in time, across oceans and down through the generations. When he invented printing, he learned to multiply these abilities so that the people, not just a select few, were able to learn and benefit from what other men had thought and recorded. The book and its allies became the principal means of serious intellectual discourse among men and nations, the essential instrument of education and progress, of scientific and cultural development.

The library thus became inevitable. No individual could anticipate his needs and have on his private bookshelf all the books he might need. The library is a millpond, storing his knowledge and information contained in books and the other means of recorded communication until it is needed to turn the millwheel. It is more than that, for not just any water will do. It must store its wares so that they can be retrieved selectively, producing what is needed for a particular use at a particular time.

I might insert a footnote here, Mr. Chairman, in the light of your reference and that of Senator Yarborough to the popular and timely musical play, "1776."

I have learned that the research for that play, a lot of the writing of it, was done in the Public Library of Morristown, N.J., and I will send you the facts for the record, or privately, when I dig them out.

The library is not that old Carnegie Building down on the corner. It is not a warehouse full of books. It is a surprisingly complex and sensitive instrument, the central and essential supporting mechanism for education at all levels, in and out of school, for the development of the new knowledge with which our society must constantly be replenished, and for the enrichment of the human spirit. I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that libraries have simply become essential to the welfare of this country. Their commitment is to advance the education of all of the people, and as centers of organized information they are a public resource and responsibility.

This has been recognized by the Congress. The number and extent of Federal programs authorized for the development and support of library services is tremendously gratifying, although we sometimes, as this last week, have occasion to deplore the discouraging discrepancy between authorization and funding. The three major acts alone (the LSCA—title II, ESEA—title II, HEA) provide authorization for 1970 expenditures of more than $480 million. In addition to this direct support there are large expenditures, direct and indirect, in a

wide variety of Federal agencies which help support library service, and no one can even estimate with any accuracy the total annual outlay by private institutions and State and local governments.

Why, then, do we need a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science? Let me suggest several reasons which seem compelling to me:

In the first place, the very magnitude of the expenditures and the multiplicity of the activities which I have just mentioned suggest the need for some coordinating mechanism which is now lacking. The library structure of this country is not monolithic, as it is in France, for example. The vigor, the imagination, and the variety which have brought American librarianship to a position of real world leadership in the past hundred years cannot and should not be forcefully constrained in any way.

But there is need for a sort of guiding intelligence, which can observe and reflect on what is happening, which can make intelligent plans for bringing better and better library service to all of the people, and which can by the very force of its logic persuade those who are directly concerned to improve their areas of the vast mosaic of library service to the American people. I suspect that the Congress itself has on occasion felt the need of a responsible, impartial scrutiny of library legislation. I can think of no mechanism better able to provide this continuing, watchful intelligence than a distinguished permanent commission, appointed by and reporting to the President and the Congress, authorized and adequately funded to carry on all of those activities listed in S. 1519.

The $500,000 authorization for expenditures of the Commission in the initial year seems small, but I believe that very substantial progress could be accomplished with this sum, as, indeed, the record of the temporary Commission with an appropriation, I believe, of somewhat in that order for work that extended over the better part of 2 years, seems to me to indicate. It must be remembered, and here I disagree with Mr. Venn as to the intention in the language of the bill—it must be remembered that this Commission is not intended to be an operating body.

The need is immediate. Others have testified to increasing demands from a growing population, escalating costs, and the difficulty of coping with the overwhelming mass of information created by and essential to modern society. No longer can individual libraries go it alone. It is clear that new patterns of cooperation and new networks for knowledge must be revoked. That central intelligence is essential to plan, to advise, and to guide.

The emerging technology of information storage, retrieval, and transfer provides both an opportunity and a problem. We can see the outline of these new networks which the new technology will make possible. but a great deal of development, experimentation and standardization must precede their full and practical implementation. In this process a wise observer and monitor will be useful and may even help both public and private agencies avoid a great deal of waste motion and expense.

The proposed legislation before your committee, Mr. Chairman, had its inception in the thoughtful and perceptive report of a temporary commission. I believe that a similar permanent commission

can continue to provide the imaginative guidance which this country will require if it is to bring to each of its citizens the full range of library and information services which he needs for personal development and productive participation in society. Therefore, on behalf of the Americal Library Association and the Association of Research Libraries, I unhesitatingly endorse S. 1519.

In closing, may I express my appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, and to your distinguished committee, for permitting me to testify on behalf of the American Library Association and the Association of Research Libraries.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to add a couple of things to the written testimony.

First, I would like to endorse the amendment proposed by Mr. Mumford. Many of the most imaginative and innovative programs of the Library of Congress were funded initially in an experimental stage by grants from outside of the Federal Government, and I believe that this Commission may itself be stimulated by and find occasion to receive grants of that sort. This amendment I think should be included.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I should like to comment on the testimony of Mr. Venn, and certain aspects of it. You may wish to draw this out in your questioning, or you may wish me simply to go ahead and review that. I will handle this either way you see fit.

Senator Pell. Why don't you just go ahead, as you will.

Mr. Dix. I have not had time to make any orderly analysis of what he has said. I would say, simply, that in intent, his testimony seems to reflect what seems to me to be some misunderstanding or some different semantic approach to the language of the bill. I do not see anything there that suggests that this is to be an operating agency, in the sense at least of any sort of administrative agency.

I think Mr. Mumford's interpretation of what the bill is about and what the proposed Commission is intended to do is a rather more accurate interpretation of the intent of the temporary Commission than the actual language of the bill.

In his prepared statement, Mr. Venn wonders if the Commission might not represent another layer on top of existing research and development activities, and so forth.

I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is precisely what it should represent and what is needed, not an operating layer but the sort of controlling intelligence. The report of the temporary National Commission uses the analogy of the nervous system and the brain. That may not be a very accurate analogy, but it expresses, I think, what is intended. What is needed, it seems to me, is an agency as independent as possible to evaluate, to review, to plan, to work toward coordination of the admirable programs going on in the various governmental agencies. I think the general mandate to the Office of Education for planning in the field of education is not specific enough. Libraries serve all kinds of agencies, all kinds of human agencies inside and outside of the Government.

They are, however, different kinds of agencies. Since they cut across similar lines, they need, I think, this controlling intelligence to observe their progress, to suggest legislation when it is needed, to evaluate, and so forth. It is not the intention of the bill, as I see it, to undertake large research and development projects. Obviously, it would take vastly greater sums to enter into, for example, a direct develop-

ment program for a library computer system. This is being done by all sorts of other agencies, public and private. It will need to have research done in the sense of evaluating studies, just as the temporary National Commission did. I believe that the series of excellent reports sponsored by that Commission have not yet been published, for the public at least, but I have seen a few of them, and when they are available I think they will be enlightening. I think this is the kind of thing we need.

Finally, I believe it is important that this Commission be clearly in intent a major Commission; it will not be a regulatory body in the sense of the Federal Communications Commission. I think the nature of our society and the nature of the varying, complex structures in this country would not permit that, and I would not be in favor of that. On the other hand, it must be a Commission of very distinguished citizens they must have the Presidential backing of the sort that the bill provides, and it must be not only empowered, but required, to report annually, and I think the force of its reports can be very compelling.

For these reasons, I would not, personally—and I have no specific authority from my association to speak on this point—I would not lean toward the kind of specific membership which Mr. Venn proposed in his testimony.

I think there is a danger when one begins to represent this segment, that segment, the other segment, either public or private agencies, for each representative to become an advocate of his own causes. What we need here is a broader, if possible, a wiser body. I happen to have served on several governmental advisory committees, one in the Office of Education and one in the Department of State. These are useful bodies, but they are advising specific agencies on specific programs. What is needed here, it seems to me, is something broader.

I think that is all I care to say at this time, Mr. Chairman, but I will be very glad to respond to questions.

Senator PELL. Thank you very much, Mr. Dix. I thought your basic testimony was extremely eloquent, particularly when you discussed one of the fundamental ways our civilization has moved the way it has been able to—which has been the ability of people to communicate with each other and make a record of that communication. I think, actually, this is the reason why the Europeans did such an effective job overcoming my own Indian forebears in America, when they came over here they were able to communicate and were able to overwhelm the indigenous population with their knowledge as well as a variety of other factors.

I was also very struck by your statement that a library should not be thought of as a warehouse or a storehouse for knowledge but as a system for retrieving knowledge. And I think that is true in education, too. I know one of the chores that will be facing this subcommittee as we go into education legislation, is to get away from the old idea that education is the cramming of the mind; it is really the opening of the mind, creating it as a tool to retrieve information and knowing where to retrieve it and how to use it and not using the mind as a warehouse, and in this regard, too, I can congratulate you.

Now, for some specific questions, however for the moment I would like to defer to the principal sponsor of the bill, the chairman of the full committee, Senator Yarborough.

Senator YARBOROUGH. Mr. Dix, your statement has been so eloquent and full, and your comment on the other testimony so concise and ably put, that I have no specific questions.

But I associate myself with the remarks of our distinguished chairman in congratulating you on it, and I sat here thinking that you were an advocate, a teacher and a stimulator of thought at the same time, because, like our chairman, what you said stimulated my thinking. I went back in your prepared statement to where you described the progress of man from the hunter in the forest to the development of materials, the transfer of progressive thoughts, and I thought of all of this being encompassed within the lifetime of one man, Sequoia. He was a simple hunter, and as he grew to manhood he wondered how the whites could defeat the Cherokees, and he came to the conclusion it was their ability to read and write and transmit information. So, he set out and spent a lifetime developing an alphabet for the Cherokees. He wrote on birch bark and laboriously composed that alphabet by which he could take adult Cherokees at 40 years of age and teach them to read and write in 6 weeks, and he could publish newspapers in the Cherokee language, so that the white settlers around them became so jealous and fearful that they drove him out and drove the Cherokees over the trail to Oklahoma, not because of the inferiority but because of the fear of their growing greatness. One man went through that whole experience in his lifetime.

Mr. DIX. Thank you, Senator, and if I might interpose simply to express my thanks for this reference. Sequoia, the great Cherokee, inventor of the Cherokee alphabet, has long been a great friend of mine in history.

Senator YARBOROUGH. Well, I admire him, too, and I think of that tragic incident when he went to California to see the great trees, exploring the trees that remained there, and while he was gone his Cherokee wife, thinking that these characters were communications he was having with the devil burned all of his records, his years of work. He came back and started all over again trying to recollect and reconstruct those characters. I think it is one of the great stories of human history, the life of Sequoia.

I want to congratulate Princeton on what it has contributed to this Nation. I know you speak not only for Princeton here but for the American Library Association and the Association of Research Libraries, but with the two Presidents it has given to the Nation—and Madison, I believe, the Bill of Rights; and Woodrow Wilson and the 14 Points and the League of Nations. Woodrow Wilson had a tremendous impact personally on my State. Texas had never had a Cabinet officer in the United States until Woodrow Wilson was President. It was a long convention in Baltimore, and the 40 Texas votes stayed with him from the first, and there was a long deadlock, I believe there were 46 ballots, or something in that neighborhood before the deadlock was broken. As the result, he appointed three Cabinet officers from Texas, though one was accredited to Missouri. Houston, the Secretary of Agriculture, had been president of two universities in Texas but still had his voting precinct in my hometown of Austin. Thomas Watts Gregory, the Attorney General, and Albert Sidney Burleson, both of whom I knew later, after them came out of the Cabinet where they were the Attorney General and Postmaster General, respectively, and

all three voted at that time in one precinct in the city of Austin. It was the same precinct that Colonel House voted in, incidentally. So, those things we attribute to Princeton.

I have no further questions.

Senator PELL. Senator Schweiker?

Senator SCHWEIKER. I would like to begin by saying my administrative assistant is a Princeton graduate, if that will help.

Well, I would like to ask Dr. Dix whether—he mentioned in his statement about the fact that the $500,000 authorization seemed small, "but I believe that very substantial progress could be accomplished with this."

Do I gather from that, Doctor, that you think that for the foreseeable future that this probably will be sufficient to meet the immediate needs; is that what you are saying in that?

Mr. DIX. I do not think that is what I am saying.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Well, then, go ahead and clarify it.

Mr. DIX. I must confess that I really have not given any particular thought to the budgeting. The temporary Commission report, I believe, proposed no specific sum. I believe that the amount in Senator Yarborough's bill was obviously, for this first year, rather arbitrarily fixed at what would be a reasonable amount. Based, I believe, on the expenditure of the temporary Commission, this gave some indication of what a permanent Commission of this sort might need. I would say, sir, that I like the provision of the bill itself where it is arbitrary for the first year, with later authorizations to be decided on the basis of the need determined during the first year. I think this is a sufficiently new kind of enterprise so that we really do not know what it will cost. I think that that is the way it will have to be. I do not mean to suggest that you should escalate very fast, but I think no one knows at this time.

So, I will have to say that I simply have no opinion on the size of the appropriation that would be required in the future.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator YARBOROUGH. I have one further question of Dr. Dix. You mentioned the reports of this Commission that was appointed by Executive order. Did you say there were six reports?

Mr. DIX. There are more than that. They are mentioned in the Commission document itself. I think they are numbered there. There were 13 separate studies.

Senator YARBOROUGH. Do you know how many pages it would be? Did you discuss whether they had been printed or not, or would be printed? Or do you have any idea of how thick that would be, or how many pages, printed say on paper with the size of the print that you have there, that size type?

Mr. DIX. No, sir; I do not. The ones that I have seen run anywhere from 30 to 100 pages of type-mimeograph document, but I do not know about the others. I have seen casually only a few, because I happened to be close to the people who did them, but I have not seen the full document.

Senator YARBOROUGH. I am going to direct the staff to assemble a set of those documents and obtain them for the committee.

I will consider them in the total volume, the cost, and I am going to consider—I want them to communicate wtih that Commission—Do

you know whether there are any plans to print them, or any part of them?

Mr. DIX. It is my understanding there are such plans. Later you will hear testimony from Mrs. Merlin Moore who was a member of that Commission, and she may be better able to elaborate.

Senator YARBOROUGH. Well, then, we will inquire further.

Mr. DIX. I believe that President Knight, who was the Chairman of that Commission, has planned a volume to be published commercially, which will contain the essence of those documents, but I am sure that Mrs. Moore will elaborate.

Senator YARBOROUGH. Well, then, we will hold that until further. Thank you.

Senator PELL. Thank you very much, indeed, Mr. Dix. It was very good to have you and we are glad you came here.

Mr. DIX. Thank you, again, Mr. Chairman.

Senator PELL. Our next witness is actually the lady to whom you referred, Mrs. Merlin Moore, State department of education, Little Rock, Ark.

Mrs. Moore, will you proceed as you will. You have a fine statement here, you can either read it or comment on it.

**STATEMENT OF MRS. MERLIN MOORE, SUPERVISOR, ECONOMIC EDUCATION, STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, LITTLE ROCK, ARK.**

Mrs. MOORE. I would like to read it and then comment briefly, sir.

I would like to thank you for allowing me the privilege of testifying before this committee and I hope that I will be of some value to you. I will read my statement first.

My name is Mrs. Merlin M. Moore. I am appearing in support of S. 1519, a bill to set up a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

I am supervisor of economic education in the Arkansas State Department of Education, and am chairman of the Arkansas Library Commission.

During 1967 and 1968, I served as an appointed member of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, established by Executive order on September 2, 1966, to appraise the role of all types of libraries in the United States, to study their needs, to evaluate their services to users, and to make recommendations which would lead to the betterment of libraries in the future.

In pursuing its work, the Commission held numerous meetings, sent out a panel of its members to 12 regional conferences in all parts of the country, and had more than a dozen special studies on pertinent library problems prepared for it.

It was my good fortune to chair most of the public hearings which the Commission held in the various parts of the Nation. I would like to say to Senator Yarborough that one of the most effective hearings we had was on the campus of Texas Tech in Lubbock. And I would also like to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that we had a hearing scheduled in New England also, and unfortunately the hearings cost more than we thought they would and we ran out of money, and we regretted that reduced schedule very much.

We were able to obtain at first hand the opinions of people representing diverse fields, of all ages, educational levels, and occupations, on what they needed from libraries, how well they were being served, and any difficulties being experienced.

During the regional hearings held by the Advisory Commission, many witnesses suggested ways in which the problems facing libraries might be solved. These suggestions included an instrumentality for advising, planning, coordinating, and evaluating, which was mentioned 219 times.

This testimony certainly supports the Commission's recommendation for a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

Other ideas involved Federal, State, regional, and local cooperation, mentioned 202 times; and the effective application of technological advances, cited 132 times.

These two areas would seem to be two of the most obvious items meriting the attention of the permanent Commission.

The evidence came in, clear and convincing, that education, science, technology, business, culture, and other phases of human activity are dependent for progress upon coordinated systems of libraries—school, college, university, research, public, and others.

However, the facts given the Commission showed that there was a great disparity in the quality of libraries of all kinds across the country. Attention must be given to a development program which will meet the needs of the user whoever he is, whether he be a preschool child, a scholar doing research, a businessman seeking a solution to a vexing problem, a student in an inner city school, or a sheepherder out on the plains.

The "knowledge explosion" has been putting ever greater demands upon U.S. citizens who are preparing themselves, or who wish to prepare themselves, to meet the challenge of this modern age.

The Commission also found that a large number of Americans were not using the educational resources of these libraries and information centers, either because they do not know about them or because they do not have sufficient reading skills.

If this Nation is to achieve its full potential of progress in all lines, both the readers and the nonreaders must be brought within the coverage and influence of libraries.

The findings of the temporary Advisory Commission's report were embodied in a report, "Library Services for the Nation's Needs: Toward the Fulfillment of a National Policy."

This was reprinted in the Congressional Record for October 21, 1968, referred to repeatedly in this hearing.

The document sets forth these objectives for overcoming current inadequacies in our libraries and information science, all of them well to keep in mind in arguing for a permanent commission:

1. Provide adequate library and informational services for formal education at all levels;
2. Provide adequate library and informational services for the public at large;
3. Provide materials to support research at all levels;
4. Provide adequate bibliographical access to the Nation's research and informational resources;

5. Provide adequate physical access to required materials or their texts throughout the Nation;

6. Provide adequate trained personnel for varied and changing demands of librarianship.

In its study of libraries and information science, the temporary Commission was constantly thwarted by the lack of adequate statistics on library resources, costs, personnel, and other administrative and planning factors. This condition applied to libraries of every type.

Statistical information was either out of date or nonexistent.

Sound planning must be based on sound figures. A permanent Commission could be effective in reporting this need on a continuing basis and insisting upon a solution.

Members recognized that problems of all kinds of libraries needed to be studied in depth before solutions could be found. Moreover, these problems needed to be studied in relation to the educational process of which libraries are an essential part.

But even the finest temporary commission on libraries can make recommendations which last at best only a relatively short time.

The needs of people change and the institutions serving them inevitably change. A permanent commission is needed to keep library planning adjusted to the altering needs.

For the reasons advanced in this statement, I wish to go on record as emphatically in favor of S. 1519.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation to you and to your committee for the opportunity afforded me to present testimony on this much needed legislation.

I would like to make a few additional comments, if I may. First of all, I would like to comment on the makeup of the proposed Commission. The temporary National Commission felt that the people appointed to this permanent Commission should be of such stature that they would command respect throughout the Nation.

We did not think that this membership should be in any way limited to categories. We thought perhaps a third of the membership, five, should be outstanding librarians and information scientists. The others we thought should be stature representatives of the general public, and we thought also that they should be appointed by the President of the United States with the advice and consent of the Senate.

These would be the kinds of people we envisage to do this job; people who have a deep understanding of the goals of our society. They would understand the need for economic growth, for example, for efficiency in our society, and for social justice, and could point these things out to the people in general. The Commission would have the kind of people to which citizens all over the Nation would listen.

As a case in point, at the regional hearings we were constantly told about the archaic laws which prevent library development in the States, and while this Commission would have no power except the power of recommendation, many times in the testimony it came out that if such a commission could guide and lead, these States would listen to this kind of advice.

Furthermore, the Commission could advise the Congress and the President on the library needs of the country, and we envision a much larger role for this Commission than is suggested in Mr. Venn's testi-

mony. I, too, have been a member of advisory commissions to the Office of Education and to other Government bodies, but we plan this to be a committee of such stature that the whole country will listen to its recommendations. We did not want, in other words, for the Commission to be limited.

As to where the Commission would be placed, we recommended HEW for a matter of housekeeping only, since this is where we were housed as a temporary commission. We, the Commission, did not think it would be well to have a permanent commission allied with any specific agencies, and we furthermore felt that it would not be wise to have members of Government agencies as members of the Commission.

Senator YARBOROUGH. In other words, the recommendation, as a recommendation drafted in the bill, that it be housed with HEW, and you did not mean under the thumb of HEW?

Mrs. MOORE. We did not mean for it to be only an advisory commission to HEW. We envisioned a much larger role for it than that. We would not want it to be a part of any agency, or attached to any agency as a part of its operating department.

Senator YARBOROUGH. After the HEW testimony—maybe this is not a fair question, and you do not have to answer it—but after HEW's testimony this morning, do you think it ought to be housed in the HEW?

Mrs. MOORE. Well, I do not think it makes much difference where it is housed, actually, providing it is a completely independent agency. I think it could be housed, for housekeeping purposes, almost anywhere, but, of course, obviously, it would be fine to be housed in an area where you have sympathy. I do not mean to imply that they would not have it in HEW. I think perhaps the Commission had in mind an altogether different type of thing than is being suggested by HEW.

Senator YARBOROUGH. Well, that is very valuable testimony, and we appreciate it very much. I noticed in your testimony there were 13 of these special studies prepared.

Mrs. MOORE. Yes. There were more than that, actually. There are 10 of them which will be published in a book, to be published commercially, and it will be out in August. There will be something like 500 pages in the book and it is now in the process of editorial completion and should be ready for the general public in August.

Some of these studies, while they were good, were not the kind we felt would be valuable for any permanent volume, so we decided on 10 of them to be included in the permanent volume; 500 pages is about as much as you can do.

Senator YARBOROUGH. I am looking over the list of 13 special studies on page 24 of this Congressional Record of October the 14th, 1968, and Carl Perkins in the House had that printed. Which of the 13 did you omit from the book?

Mrs. MOORE. I do not believe I can give you that now but we will be happy to supply that information.

Senator YARBOROUGH. I am going to direct the staff to study the list and find out which three were omitted. We will study those and we might print those in the Congressional Record or order them printed as documents of this committee, if we decide that they are

needed technically by libraries and librarians, though they might not have such an appeal to cause you to print them commercially.

Mrs. MOORE. Another comment that I would like to make, sir, is about the problem that we are in concerning appropriations for libraries. If a Commission had been in operation then the needs of libraries over the country would be known better than they are now. In going about over the country, in conducting these hearings, we discovered that the people in general really did not know about the needs of libraries.

A library has no emotional appeal, so it is a little hard to get this across to the general public.

Senator YARBOROUGH. You did not quite have the influence in the Congress as the Defense Department for its $80 billion?

Mrs. MOORE. I am afraid not. I have been lobbying for library legislation for many years, and I have found it very hard, for example, to convince the legislative body in my own State of the needs of the State library building there as compared to some other needs. We finally decided to take our issue to the people, and we think we can do better than with the legislature.

Senator YARBOROUGH. Well, I thank you for this fine statement. As you know, Mrs. Moore, you are a neighbor of the State of Texas and we have a close affiliation with Arkansas. When Arkansas and Texas were settled with Anglo-Americans they came primarily through New Orleans, because Texas was separated largely by water and it was difficult for overland travel, but when we were fighting for independence most of our fighters came through Arkansas, and from Arkansas, James Bowie, Davy Crockett, Sam Houston, and I do not know what that proves except Arkansas is maybe a little more militant than other areas.

Mrs. MOORE. You know that old joke, I suppose, about that. I do not like to tell it here, but it was said that all of the folks who could read went on to Texas, and those who could not stayed in Arkansas. We resented this version of the story very much.

Senator YARBOROUGH. You are the first Arkansonian I ever saw that would admit the true version of the book.

Mrs. MOORE. In connection with this whole matter of appropriations, I have a story that I think you might be interested in about a young couple who were having considerable budget trouble. So the husband issued an edict to his wife, "You must find a way to cut the budget."

Of course, she was very upset about this, but when he came home in the evening she said, "I have found the answer and I will tell you at dinner."

And so, at dinner he eagerly was awaiting the answer, and she said, "I have discovered what we will cut out. We will cut out black pepper." This is about the relationship, as it relates to the total budget of the United States, that this cut in library programs represents. It has meant cutting out the black pepper, and it has also meant cutting out the spice in the educational process.

I just could not leave without making that final comment.

Senator YARBOROUGH. It is cutting out the black pepper in relation to the total cost.

Mrs. MOORE. That is right.

Senator YARBOROUGH. But as a percentage of the program, it cuts out the heart. There is only a token cut percentagewise, for a majority of the budget. The budget has directed that only some 30-odd percent of the total authorized moneys be appropriated for the whole complex of educational legislation, and it cuts the health, all of the health laws of the Congress, everything that affects people and the welfare of people in the United States not merely to the bone, but into the heart.

Mrs. MOORE. I would like to comment——

Senator PELL. I would like to comment on that story. I thought that what the wife was going to say was that they were going to cut out the dinner, and that would be the solution, and this is what I think we have done so often with learning, is to just cut out dinner.

Mrs. MOORE. Well, for me that would not have been a bad idea.

I would like to make one final comment, if I may, sir. I noticed that in President Nixon's statement about National Library Week, he said our libraries with new programs and new media techniques have become an exciting and effective center of innovation. We would hope that this National Commission, among other things, would encourage innovation in ways to reach all of the people which we found in our hearings were not being reached by any educational program.

Senator YARBOROUGH. Thank you.

Senator PELL. I have two specific questions here.

Mrs. MOORE. Yes, sir.

Senator PELL. This question is submitted by the minority: In section 7 the bill provides an authorization of $500,000 for fiscal year 1970. It leaves the amounts open without an upper limit for subsequent fiscal years. Should, in your view, the committee stipulate a specific authorization for the subsequent years, and if you do think there should be a top limit, what amount would you suggest?

Mrs. MOORE. I think it would be very difficult to say, Mr. Chairman. I think I would favor Mr. Dix' statement. I think it will be difficult at this stage to say how much is needed, but I think it might be wise to leave the authorization open for future years. The experience of the Commission will determine its needs. The temporary Commission set up a budget on what it thought it could use, but as I pointed out in my testimony, we ran out of money, for example, for the hearings.

The experience of the permanent Commission and the stature of the people we hope would be appointed will determine the amount to be put in the budget. I think this will be better, perhaps, left open.

Senator PELL. Thank you.

My other question is in connection with your comment that the Commission also found a large number of Americans were not using the educational resources of libraries and information science, either because they do not know about them or because they do not have sufficient reading skills.

I was wondering if you would elaborate a little bit on the latter part of that question or problem, about their not having sufficient reading skills.

Mrs. MOORE. Well, we discovered, of course, that many of the people who are adults now grew up without the advantages of libraries of any

kind. As was pointed out, there were no school libraries, and the public libraries were very inadequate, and consequently people did not become readers.

Then, of course, I am sorry to say that in this country we do still have a great deal of illiteracy, and we found that many of those people were not using the libraries.

However, we found in our hearings some very innovative approaches in this area where, through the use of films and other audiovisual materials. a great deal of material was being used.

We found, for example, that in Alaska a great many of the Eskimos who could not read were using recordings, and other materials which were designed for the blind. They were using those instead of books because they could not read.

Another thing that I think the Commission might do in this regard, sir, is, of course, to point up these kinds of innovative ways of reaching people. Then another thing, which is not exactly in answer to your question, but one I would like to comment on, is that the Commission could point out to the Congress, with great clarity, I think, the kinds of supporting library service which are needed in various programs.

For example, the manpower program which was passed by the Congress, and the Headstart program. Actually there were no supporting library services for these, and somebody had to supply library service. In Arkansas we found that in the Headstart program our inadequately supported public libraries, because we have a constitutional tax limit, were supplying these library services to the Headstart program.

Now, this is something that the Congress could not be expected to pick up and know about, but with expert advice from the Commission they would know the need of supporting library services for these programs.

Another area would be vocational education and the trade schools, which are being supported and encouraged all over the Nation. We found in these programs in Arkansas that most of the students drive in, say, 50 miles. Then they go home and do their homework and they use the local public libraries. But no supporting money is put in the library program for this vocational work.

So, I think this Commission could give specific advice to the Congress on the kinds of library support which should be written into bills which demand library services.

Senator PELL. Thank you very much.

Mrs. MOORE. Thank you.

Senator YARBOROUGH. Mrs. Moore, this is a very stimulating paper, and what you are talking about in developing materials reminds me of an experience that I had at the Job Corps Centers at McNary, Tex. this spring. Many of those disadvantaged youths brought in there, 17 and 18 years of age, were illiterate. They start giving them basic English and basic mathematics, and they find that they can very often grasp about 5 years of mathematics in what you would have in conventional school educational systems, while they were grasping 1 year of reading and writing and English. So, they have developed their own set of textbooks down there, and they have printed and revised them, and they have mathematics textbooks in colors or numbers without a word in there because they cannot read and write, but they grasp

ahead about 5 or 6 years in mathematics and develop mathematic problems, and they are teaching them their trades before they even learn to read or write their names. It is a very interesting experience in education.

Thank you very much. We are very proud of your testimony here. I have an in-law in Arkansas. My wife is from Pine Bluff, and her mother passed away a few years ago, and I visited Arkansas generally at once a year for nearly 40 years.

Mrs. MOORE. My late husband was from Pine Bluff so we have a lot in common.

Senator PELL. Thank you very much.

Our next witness is Mr. Joseph Becker, president of the American Society for Information Science, Bethesda, Md.

Mr. Becker, would you proceed.

## STATEMENT OF MR. JOSEPH BECKER, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR INFORMATION SCIENCE, BETHESDA, MD.

Mr. BECKER. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee. I wish to thank you very much for inviting me to speak as an officer of the American Society for Information Science with respect to Senate bill 1519.

My name is Joseph Becker and I am the current president of the American Society for Information Science (ASIA), a professional society of 3,000 members which provides a forum for the advancement of information science and information systems in education, business, industry, and government.

Its constitutents are concerned with all aspects of communicating, utilizing and storing digital and graphic information, and in developing information science as a strong professional activity in our national life.

My personal background and education has been in engineering, in librarianship, and in the computer sciences. I currently teach information science to librarians at Catholic University in Washington, D.C.

Those who preceded me, Dr. Mumford, Dr. Dix, and Mrs. Bessie Moore, eloquently stated the importance and the general need for a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

In supporting S. 1519, I wish to emphasize the relationship of information science to libraries and of the importance of having the two professions represented in the proposed bill as equal partners.

Perhaps a little background is in order. The phrase "information science" is of fairly recent origin. It was coined to described a new professional discipline made up of mathematicians, engineers, computer specialists, operations researchers, systems analysts, psychologists, linquists, librarians, and others.

In formation science aims to improve all information systems by applying the principles of scientific management and by adopting, wherever practicable, the new computer and communications technologies.

It brings together interdisciplinary skills from several professions and through them develops new theories, generates ideas, and applies new techniques to all areas of information storage, retrieval, and transfer.

Information science is deeply interested in the problems of literacy. It is equally concerned with the varied and complex information processes found in education, business, and government.

Every profession and every organization today suffers from information overload and information science seeks to ease this burden by finding long-range solutions to basic problems.

More and more, information has become an essential ingredient to decisionmaking in our society and its importance increases as a function of time.

The American Society for Information Science is dedicated toward conserving, protecting, and strengthening our national information assets.

During its recent study the National Advisory Commission on Libraries identified some very real and critical areas of particular concern to information science: shortage of skilled manpower; the rising costs of information operations; the growing information needs of an expanding population, a more literate population, a more mobile population; and the increasing rate of publication and others.

It is also described emerging new forms of information storage such as: digital tapes, video tapes and microgrophic forms.

It stressed the impact of the new technology and the need for networks to interconnect the great array of institutional, scholarly, and research resources in our Nation's libraries and information centers.

And, it also explained the requirement for planning systems compatibility in order to achieve processing economies and provide a logical framework for future development. These are but a few of the challenges which confront the information science community today.

The American Society for Information Science welcomes the opportunity provided by S. 2339 to develop a partnership with libraries through the work of a National Commission.

Information science is a natural extension of the field of librarianship and I believe that many benefits will accrue to both elements by virtue of the close collaboration which a National Commission will undoubtedly engender.

In my opinion, the establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as called for in S. 2339 is essential for several reasons.

First, because of the desirability of having a focal point in government to set policy and coordinate programs.

Second, because of the need to understand more clearly than we do the nature of the changing role of libraries and information services in our society.

The third reason concerns the urgent requirement to interconnect our information resources and form statewide and national information networks. Only a commission with national perspective can make this a reality.

Finally, because we need to equip and educate a new type of specialist who is knowledgeable and comfortable both in the world of library science and the world of technology.

Let me elaborate just a bit on these four points.

First, a permanent commission can serve as a focal point in our Government to set policy and coordinate action. It is very logical for the Federal Government to assume this key role because it already

is deeply involved in research and operating programs of major influence.

I should add that these programs, in my opinion, have been very effective and are very well along. Government is also responsible for funding many information activities in education and in the private sector through the Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, the Library of Congress, the National Library of Medicine, the National Agricultural Library, and so forth.

A commission can provide a workable framework to guide the development of these many different existing and emerging Federal programs.

Secondly, a permanent commission can serve as a catalyst by bringing together the interdisciplinary expertise that is critical to the solution of information problems.

I believe the library profession has much to give and gain through closer interaction ties with the computer industry.

In general, information science has up to now been more closely identified with the new modern technology than has librarianship.

Linking the common interests of libraries and information science under the purview of a single commission will do much to bring about closer professional collaboration and speedier adoption of the new technologies whenever practicable.

Third, a permanent commission can serve as a mechanism for promoting changes in the library's role in society by accelerating network interconnection among libraries and information centers thereby removing the constraints of time and distance which formerly inhibited an individual's access to the totality of the Nation's information resources. I am also vice president of the intercommunity communications council (EDUCOM). In our network activities in higher education, we have discovered the need for new types of information packages. Intercommunity communications will permit faculty and students at different universities to support scholarship, research, and education in new ways by providing the opportunity to share distant information resources through two-way interaction with the material. We can, I think, look forward to universities without walls and then to libraries without walls.

Communications developments of the last decade are going to increase interaction and encourage functional cooperation between and among libraries throughout the country, and eventually throughout the world.

A permanent commission can provide the context, and this is my last point, for desirable and urgently needed educational development within the field.

Information science and librarianship are two sides of the same coin. An important need exists to provide the educational environment in which these combined professional interests can flourish.

A commission can provide the necessary support that will insure the smooth and continuous development of the human resources and skills that are required.

I think we must remember at all times that the basis for any effective development in this area are human beings, and at the present time we have too few human beings who understand both the world of technology and the world of information. No matter how effective and useful our technological advancements may be, they really get us

no where unless we have a firm foundation of human resources in the Nation that can carry forward these principles in an intelligent manner.

In summary, let me say that access in the United States to information is a public right, but a rapidly increasing population and a rapidly expanding universe of information are introducing more constraints and preventing the public from freely exercising this right. This is what I deduce from reading the National Advisory Commission's report.

The objective then is to remove these impediments to knowledge by developing suitable mechanisms for facilitating the distribution and communication of information in all forms to all citizens.

I think Mrs. Moore expressed this quite eloquently when she said we need to reach all of the people.

I believe that the establishment of a permanent Commission on Libraries and Information Science is the method by which this important national objective can be achieved.

Before I close, sir, I wish to propose an amendment for your consideration.

On page 4, section 6(a) in line 14, I suggest we strike out the word "specialist" and insert in lieu thereof the word "scientist".

Senator YARBOROUGH. What line is that on page 4?

Mr. BECKER. It is page 4, section 6(a), line 14, sir.

Senator YARBOROUGH. And what is the suggested amendment?

Mr. BECKER. That we strike the word "specialist" and replace it by the word "scientist". Throughout the bill the phrase information science is used. The word "specialist" has a different professional meaning and I believe the word "scientist" more aptly, expresses the type of person to be considered as a member of the Commission.

Senator YARBOROUGH. Is not "specialist" a much broader term than "scientist"?

Mr. BECKER. I think so; and I think it is a more misunderstood term. Since this is a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science I think it would be more appropriate to use the phrase "information scientists". Otherwise, there may be some confusion when selections are made for Commission membership.

Senator YARBOROUGH. Well, we will consider that suggested amendment. I accept it, not the amendment, but the suggestion, without any opinion one way or the other. Would you care to write us a letter and discuss it and give us the difference in the meaning?

Mr. BECKER. I certainly will, sir. That would be my intent.

Senator YARBOROUGH. Not merely from the dictionary, but in the common acceptance of information for the community use.

Mr. BECKER. That concludes my remarks.

Senator YARBOROUGH. We have your recommendation on dissemination of information and libraries, of course, and we have had in the Health Subcommittee under the leadership of Lister Hill over the years the development of dissemination of medical information. It is an attempt to tie the small rural hospital with the major hospitals with our two-way television networks, so that when there is need for immediate emergency operations of the type that in the small hospitals the doctors are not familiar with, they can be hooked together with specialists by two-way television networks and the doctor who is a

specialist or an expert can direct them and tell them how to proceed while the operation is actually going on.

This could be done, and I will not consume time by further elaboration, but there are many means of using information and you stress it here from the library standpoint. Dr. Mumford has expressed that many times before the Appropriations Committee in his appeals for funds to develop services along this line in the Library of Congress.

Thank you very much for this statement and for the research that went into it and the consolidation of the points in the very fine supporting statement, in support of your recommendation.

Senator PELL. I am particularly struck with your statement, and have been in the past, of the view that much more use could be made of the information sciences and the systems approach or computer techniques. I think we on the Hill would be very well advised to take advantage of these approaches because we do not do so, as far as I know—we have the Legislative Reference Service, and we have a variety of supporting areas, and we have a marvelous operation for mailing letters out to our constituents, but when it comes to using the computer to try and produce better legislation, we have kept that at arm's length. I am wondering if you had any views in this regard. Do you have any recommendations to us on the Hill how we could make better use, for instance, in the handling of this bill through the computer and the systems approach?

Mr. BECKER. Well, I think——

Senator PELL. It is a little off the subject, but I am greatly interested in it.

Mr. BECKER. I think, Senator, it would be presumptious of me to make any specific suggestions.

Senator PELL. Not at all. We need them.

Mr. BECKER. I do understand that there is a bill before the Congress for establishing a data processing activity in support of the Congress.

There has been—computer applications started first in the engineering area, and it was very successful there.

Then it moved into the area of business applications and industry, and here too, over the last decade, I would say it has made some rather remarkable strides.

In terms of handling information, per se, this is still in the research and experimentation area. We do not have very well conceived programs of information retrieval that are dependable.

On the other hand, I would perceive, from what I understand of the mechanics of Congressional operations, that there are many functions that are equivalent to those performed in business, which could benefit by the application of computers to such operations.

So, I would say that in the area of congressional procedures, in the area of improving functions, in the area of printing, in the area of bill management, there certainly are opportunities to apply computer technology, as well as computer system. When we speak in terms of trying to improve on the intellectual organization of bills, that is their content, modifying in any way the intellectual processes of the Congress, here I am skeptical at the present time that we have the right tools to really support you.

Senator PELL. You do not recall any specifics of the bill you spoke of.

Mr. BECKER. No, sir. I could certainly bring it to your attention in the form of a letter.

Senator PELL. Thank you very much.

Are you familiar with the work of Constantinos Doxiades in this regard?

Mr. BECKER. No, I am not.

Senator PELL. The development of the science of ekistics? The work of relating the systems approach to our problems?

Mr. BECKER. No, I am not, sir.

Senator PELL. Thank you very much, and you are excused, Mr. Becker.

Thank you so much for your interesting statement.

If there anybody else in the room who would like to come forward to offer any additional testimony or comments?

If not, this hearing will be recessed subject to the call of the Chair and the record will remain open until May the 5th, I think we all owe a debt of gratitude to the introducer of the bill, the sponsor of the bill, Senator Yorborough.

Thank you.

Senator YARBOROUGH. I want to express my gratitude to the chairman for so promptly setting the hearings. The date on which the hearing is held is one of the major factors regarding whether a bill passes or not.

I find that this bill is receiving one of the prime opportunities in the Congress by this early hearing and we are indebted to the distinguished Chairman.

Senator PELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

At this point I order printed in the record statements, letters, and other pertinent material submitted to the Subcommitee.

(The material referred to follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE LIBRARY SERVICE,
*Providence, R.I., April 22, 1969.*

Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL,
*U.S. Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR PELL: Legislation in S.1519 would, at long last, place in a National body the responsibility for library development. The Commission, by defining both immediate and long-term goals, would provide essential leadership.

Centralizing information relating to libraries would greatly expedite their improvement, because, for the first time, practices and policies of the fifty states would be known and shared. This coordination of knowledge and effort would avoid needless duplication and fragmentation. Librarians in all areas would undoubtedly welcome the opportunity of assisting in every way to promote this research and development so essential to our nation's libraries. The Commission could, through studies and reports, make available the status of library conditions. It would evaluate programs and develop procedures for total utilization of library resources, based on factual knowledge and professional expertise.

This Commission, composed as it would be of members of the profession and citizens of special competence, would be in a position to respond to needs in these times of exploding information and change. We hope that S. 1519 will receive favorable action by both the Senate and the House, and will become a major force in library progress.

Very sincerely yours,

ELIZABETH G. MYER, *Director.*

PREPARED STATEMENT OF VIRGINIA G. YOUNG, PAST PRESIDENT, AMERICAN LIBRARY TRUSTEE ASSOCIATION

As one deeply concerned with libraries, I welcome the opportunity to file a statement in support of S. 1519, a bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

My name is Mrs. Raymond A. Young. I have served as a member and President of the Columbia Public Library Board of Trustees, as a member and President of the Missouri State Library Commission, and as President of the American Library Trustee Association. Library trustees involved in policy making, short-range, and long-range planning certainly recognize the urgency of establishing a National Commission on Libraries.

S. 1519 provides the first step by the National Congress in declaring that the American people have library resources and facilities as a matter of National Policy.

I wholeheartedly concur with the objectives set out by the National Advisory Commission on Libraries on which a national library program should be based:

1. Provide adequate library and informational services for formal education at all levels;
2. Provide adequate library and informational services for the public at large;
3. Provide materials to support research at all levels;
4. Provide adequate bibliographical access to the Nation's research and informational resources;
5. Provide adequate physical access to required materials or their texts throughout the Nation;
6. Provide adequate trained personnel for varied and changing demands of librarianship.

Certainly S. 1519 will implement the fulfillment of these objectives.

Those intimately familiar with libraries today—school, public, academic, special—will agree that the state and local facilities are not enough to cope with our many problems. Only a National Policy, clearly enunciated and sufficiently implemented, will make possible the accomplishment of those goals.

The planning function of the Commission would call for research, fact gathering, and the development of a coordinated federal library program.

It has been my privilege to speak on library matters in most of the states in the union, including Governor's Conferences on Libraries which brought large groups of citizens together from throughout the state. There is a ground swell of great proportions for better library facilities, more books, better transmittal of information between libraries, etc.

The tempo of the times has brought about a wide range of diverse needs served by libraries: whether it be scientific research, continuing education, information or personal pleasure and renewal, just to name a few. Tensions of the day call for information and ideas in solving problems. The library has the resources for transforming apprehension into comprehension.

With the information explosion a reality, and with the means available for better transmittal of information, I feel that the establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science is the best possible way to provide the clear eyed leadership for library service in its total concept which is wanted and deserved by the citizens of this country.

---

DURHAM, N.C., *April 23, 1969.*

Senator CLAIBORNE PELL,
*Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

As Chairman of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, I wish to indicate my strong support of Senate bill 1519 to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and request that my testimony be added to the record of the hearings, which I regretted I could not attend.

DOUGLAS M. KNIGHT,
*President, Duke University.*

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES,
*April 30, 1969.*

Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL.

DEAR SENATOR PELL: In response to your letter of 17 April, I am pleased to have the opportunity to communicate to you my enthusiastic support of S. 1519, a bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. One of the reasons for my great satisfaction in doing so is that both you and I were involved, during the administration of the late President John F. Kennedy, in the initial efforts to bring the need for such a Commission to the attention of the Congress and the Nation. The time that has passed between that beginning and, hopefully, this realization has made the establishment of this National Commission a matter of even greater urgency.

There are many reasons why an independent and strong National Commission on Libraries and Information Science is needed by the Nation. They have been documented in the excellent report of the Presidential Advisory Commission on Libraries, and you have heard them expressed clearly, and at times eloquently, in the testimony given before your subcommittee on 24 April by Mr. L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress, and Mr. William S. Dix, Librarian of Princeton University. I shall not attempt here to repeat what already has been said so effectively. I should rather like to address myself to the need for this Commission as I see it from my vantage point as the University Librarian of Harvard University and as the President of the Association of Research Libraries.

There is no doubt in my mind that the great research libray here at Harvard, with its present collection of almost eight million volumes, is not satisfying the legitimate information needs of the University's faculty and students as well as it filled those needs a generation ago when its resources were only half as large. My colleagues in the Association of Research Libraries find themselves in the same situation, and I am sure that every school, public and special librarian faces a similar problem.

The Librarians who organized the Association of Research Libraries thirty-seven years ago foresaw our present difficulties. In 1932 they formed the Association because they knew that without cooperative efforts they would not be able to provide the research materials needed by the scholars in their own institutions and throughout the country to whom these libraries have a special responsibility.

In spite of all the cooperative efforts initiated by libraries—and these efforts have increased markedly within the last five years—the effort to select, acquire, organize and make available the library materials, produced in every corner of the globe, which our citizens need is increasingly difficult and inadequate.

The reasons for this situation are clear. The remarkable increase in scientific, technological and sociological research, which has characterized the years since World War II, has resulted in information requirements which are staggering and in a volume of publications of similar proportions. Increasingly, research is interdisciplinary in character, a phenomenon that places special and heavy burdens on libraries. During this same period we have witnessed an unprecedented expansion of the American educational effort, ranging from pre-school instruction through post-doctoral study. Further, we all know that we live in an age in which international understanding of different political and social structures is imperative if our world is to survive. Here in the United States we face the challenge of creating a changed society, one which is becoming increasingly urbanized and ever more dependent upon technological advances. Somehow we must insure that this society is also humane. These challenges call for information, both in quantity and quality, in amounts undreamed of a generation ago.

During the last fifteen years, libraries, local and state governments and the Federal Government, through an enlightened sequence of legislation, have attempted to meet the growing national need. Networks of public libraries are being formed throughout the country; state-wide systems of acquisition, cataloguing and distribution of library materials have been undertaken, especially in New York, Ohio and Colorado; and the institutions of higher education have formed various kinds of consortium in order to share their resources more effectively. The Federal Government has aided all of these projects since 1956 when the Library Services and Construction Act was passed.

Yet we do not have today any group or agency capable of developing a national plan for information resources. All of the cooperative efforts we now see, effec-

tive as they are, are fragmented. They involve counties, a state, or a number of states. Federal support for library programs is scattered among a number of agencies with little or no coordination of planning and project implementation. It is precisely this void in national planning and coordination which would be filled by the proposed National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

The need for this Commission is all too apparent. Its establishment cannot be delayed if libraries are to be effective instruments in eliminating functional illiteracy and in enriching the human spirit. The citizens of our nation will be eternally indebted to the 91st Congress for making this Commission a reality.

I urge, therefore, the passage of S. 1519.

Let me take this opportunity, on behalf of the Association of Research Libraries, to thank you, Senator Yarborough, and the other members of your Subcommittee for your efforts to bring the National Commission to fruition. The Association of Research Libraries stands ready to assist you in any manner you deem appropriate. I know you will not hesitate to call upon our Executive Director, Dr. Stephen A. McCarthy, for any assistance he may be able to give you. And, needless to say, I should be delighted to help in any way at any time.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS W. BRYANT, *President.*

---

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,
*Washington, D.C., May 2, 1969.*

Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL,
*U.S. House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I should like to indicate our strong support for S. 1519, a bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

I can do no better than to quote a formal statement adopted by our Broad of Directors in January of this year. The pertinent material is contained in the following paragraph:

"Of critical importance to both the quality and the growth of higher education is provision for adequate library resources and of computer facilities. With the exponential growth of knowledge, the problem of research libraries is particularly acute. There are many issues, such as the use of copyrighted material in computers, that must still be resolved, if the possibilities of modern technology are to be realized. In the meantime, however, we strongly endorse the findings of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, the programs of the American Library Association, and such new programs addressed to these problems as Networks for Knowledge, enacted with board bipartisan support by the Ninetieth Congress. We also urge continued study of how best to meet computer needs on our 2,000 campuses, for clear as those needs are, they could devour an inordinate proportion of the new resources likely to be available to higher education."

I hope very much that our statement of support may be incorporated in the Record.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. MORSE, *Director.*

---

MCGRAW-HILL BOOK CO.,
*New York, N.Y., May 6, 1969.*

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.:*

As a member of the President's National Advisory Commission on Libraries, I should like to emphasize the crucial importance of S. 1519 to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. This was the key recommendation of the Advisory Commission after a long and exhaustive study. Library activities support in one way or another almost every national objective and they are scattered through numerous agencies of the Government. What is needed above all is some continuing, competent, distinguished, neutral body, in itself responsible for any library operations or grant programs, that can bring into focus our diverse library needs and our varied programs to meet them. This is as essential for economy and efficiency in the identification of duplicating or ineffective programs as is the great task of identifying our critical needs and devising the means to meet them.

These library needs cover the range of our national responsibilities from the preschool training of children in Headstart and similar programs, the attack on functional illiteracy, the provision of new educational and social services in urban ghettos and other poverty areas and the improvement of education throughout our school and university systems to the maintenance and support of advanced research programs in medicine, scientific technology, international relations, social studies, and the humanities, and the nature of an independently informed citizenry.

The crushing library appropriation cuts just proposed by the administration coming, as they do, in the midst of a nationwide crisis in the State and local support of educational and library services, threaten summarily to choke off the promising new developments in library services so desperately needed. Yet they probably reflect no intention on the part of the administration to bring about so drastic an effect. Rather we have stumbled into this position because we have no agency that can survey the entire national picture of library needs and activities, assess the result of particular actions, and make informed recommendations for priorities and programs. There could be no more urgent and emphatic demonstration of the need for S. 1519.

Respectfully,

DAN LACY, *Senior Vice President.*

---

INFORMATION INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION,
*Washington, D.C., May 2, 1969.*

Hon. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: In connection with S. 1519 the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Act, I am pleased to offer the following comments. My interest in the bill arises from three connections:

Intimate involvement with the establishment of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries by President Johnson in 1966.

Service as Chairman, National Systems Task Force, of the Committee for Scientific and Technical Information (the Federal Council for Science and Technology). This task force sponsored and guided the study of National Document-handling Systems in Science and Technology.

Current service as President of the Information Industry Association, a non-profit trade association of firms pioneering in applying the new information and communication technologies to providing more adequate informational products and services.

The important role of libraries in the increasingly information-oriented U.S. society needs no elaboration. A strong network of public and private libraries and their modern counterparts, the information centers, are vital elements in achieving national goals. I strongly support the establishment of the proposed National Commission.

Because libraries have traditionally operated independently and without regard to possible library systems or networks, a new look is required at their organization, functions, financing, procedures, personnel, etc., in order to ensure that the totality of library operations serves national, state, and local needs in an optimal manner. It calls for a systems analysis approach.

It is regrettable that the National Advisory Commission on Libraries was unable to do more than suggest a continuation of its work under the proposed National Commission on Libraries and Information Science act. The problems of libraries are immediate and serious. Recent suggestions to shut down the Newark Public Library and announced plans to drastically curtail New York City Public Library services are symptomatic. The predicament these and other libraries find themselves in could, and should, be the occasion for examining measures libraries might take to establish a sounder, long-term program to ensure general public support for the important role they play.

My major concern with the detailed provisions of S. 1519 is about the duties of the proposed Commission. S. 1519 focusses on operational-type activities instead of leadership-type activities. What is most needed is an active, fast-moving Commission asking broad-gauged, national policy questions, and supporting studies to derive answers only when existing agencies and organizations are unable to handle them. The accent should clearly be on innovative thinking and practice in the library and information services field. The kind of tough questions to ask are, for example, the optimal allocation of Federal resources to the

various kinds of library and information services. Specifically, which should be a higher priority—conventional libraries for schools in underprivileged urban areas, or mobile libraries for rural areas, or university libraries serving the local community? Which is the *most* pressing national need—new facilities or new staff? These are the types of national policy issues which only the proposed Commission can realistically study.

On the other hand, conventional studies, surveys, and analyses of the library and informational needs of the nation and the role libraries play in meeting those needs could easily be handled by the Office of Education's Library Services Division. Likewise, such an operating agency could provide technical assistance and advice to Federal agencies and other organizations regarding library services.

The leadership role of the proposed Commission would include emphasis on the new possibilities for improved library services given by the new information storage and retrieval, information processing and communication technologies. This will almost certainly require an easy familiarity on the part of Commission members with information processing and communication technologies. Identification of many Commission members with traditional library practices would lessen the chances of the Commission performing the vital innovative role so badly needed. The Commission should pay especial attention to the supply and training of the people staffing library and information services. It could be a valuable ally for those educational institutions endeavoring to do a significantly better job.

I also question whether the proposed Commission should "have *the* primary responsibility for developing plans" in this area. It should study the problem sufficiently to have good ideas about major directions and thrusts, but the primary planning responsibility for library funding and operations in elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher education, as well as public libraries, should remain with the Office of Education. Other organizations will be developing plans for library service improvement in their special area, too, such as in science and technology, in statistical information, and other adult interest areas.

I suggest that the title of the Commission be changed to "National Commission on Libraries and Information Services." The accent on *information science*, which is at best a very ambiguous phrase, is misplaced. The application of available information technology will be more important to the improvement of library functions over the next few years than information science. On the other hand, "information services" clearly identifies a set of functions which are parallel to, complementary to, and to some people would actually include library services.

If I can be of further help, please let me know.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM T. KNOX.

---

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES,
*April 22, 1969.*

Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Education,*
*U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR PELL: I am writing you on behalf of the Association of Research Libraries to express the support of the Association for S. 1519, a bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

The association of Research Libraries is the principal organization of the major university and research libraries of the country. The Association took a deep interest in the work of the temporary National Advisory Commission on Libraries and Information Science and, at its recent midwinter meeting in Washington, it adopted a Position Statement supporting the major recommendations of the National Advisory Commission.

The chief recommendation is the establishment of a permanent National Commission as S. 1519 provides. I enclose a copy of that statement and a list of the members of the Association.

In support of its position recommending favorable action on this bill the Association would call attention to the following points:

1. There is at present no agency which has the authority or the mission to develop coherent national plans in the field of libraries and information science.

2. There are many Federal libraries and agencies, as well as libraries operating under state and local authorities and in the private sector, all of which are carrying on programs and developing plans in the field of libraries and information science. This activity is now fragmented and uncoordinated and some of it may be duplicative. It can be shaped into a coherent plan only if a high level Commission is appointed with the authority provided in this bill.

3. The National Commission would not duplicate the work of any existing library or agency nor would it deprive any existing library or agency of its present power and authority. Instead, the National Commission would bring into focus the activities presently being carried on, and would disclose areas which require more attention and development.

4. In order to achieve its objective the National Commission should be an independent agency since it will be responsible for developing plans and for coordinating the efforts of a wide variety of libraries and agencies. Should it be made part of any existing agency, it would be impossible to exercise the kind of overall planning at the national level which was envisaged by the temporary National Commission.

5. Membership on the Commission should include men who are interested in and knowledgeable in the field of libraries and information science, as well as public spirited citizens who are prepared to devote time and effort to this matter. Members of the Commission should not be appointed as representatives of existing libraries and agencies because the Commission is expected to consider the total picture and not to be concerned with the specific needs of objectives of a particular library or agency.

6. Appointment of the Commission by the President with the requirement that annual reports be made to the President and Congress is, in our judgment, essential if men of the high calibre that are needed are to be persuaded to serve on this Commission.

I enclose a statement on the National Commission recently prepared by a Director of this Association, Robert Vosper of the University of California at Los Angeles.

Your support of S. 1510 will be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN A. MCCARTHY,
*Executive Director.*

---

THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

(By Robert Vosper, University Librarian, University of California, Los Angeles)

The Association of Research Libraries, established in 1932, comprises 83 institutional members, the larger university libraries of the country and certain other research libraries of national importance. While these are independent institutions serving particular clienteles, they are voluntarily inter-related in a variety of ways so that their collections and services are widely available to scholars and advanced students throughout the country. They have long recognized this larger social responsibility and have continuously been seeking ways to improve and extend their capacity thus to serve the nation.

In this effort to increase the coordinate strength and efficiency of libraries, there has been in increasingly felt need for an overall guiding intelligence at the national level. This is why the United States needs a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science—to be certain that we go down the right road, at the proper speed, and with continuous rather than intermittent guidance.

In the past decade several compelling developments have changed the library and information scene dramatically. The so-called "information explosion" has multiplied the amount of significant publication and useful information needed by scholars, researchers, government officials, practitioners in many fields of endeavor, and informed citizens. The "information explosion" has occurred, to a considerable extent, because of the increasing pace and amount of research—scientific, technical, and sociological research—that the Federal government has fostered at universities and in industry. In addition, many new countries have come into their own on the international scene, have increased their literacy levels, and have produced published information that our scholars, advanced students, and officials must have access to. Furthermore, new methods for obtaining, organizing, and distributing information have come onto the scene or been markedly improved: computer transmission devices, and the like. At the same time the expansion of the American educational effort, at all levels, and both

qualitatively and numerically, has sharply increased the numbers of institutions, students, and scholars requiring rapid access to complex and informational services.

Thus, information has increased in amount and complexity, the users have increased in numbers and sophistication, the pace of intellectual and social change has increased, and the technology has advanced in complexity and in cost. All of these factors have required a more effective and a speedier library and information service across the nation.

To help meet this need the Federal Government since 1956 has created an enlightened sequence of important legislation. Today, Federal library involvement is the responsibility of a great number of departments and agencies throughout the governmental structure. Moreover, the Federal government in all of its parts is itself a primary producer, storer, and user of information and library services.

The very complexity, variety, and rapid pace of this important intellectual activity, involving as it does many jurisdictional levels (Legislative and Executive, local and national, as well as the private sector), are the basis for the proposal to establish a National Commission.

Such a body of distinguished citizens and eminent practitioners could give continuing and forsighted attention to the public interest in this important and pervasive field. It could rationalize and focus our present efforts, legislative and practical. It could engage in continuous long-range planning, setting goals and road maps for the future. It could rise above the special needs of particular groups or particular agencies and thus with impartiality see to the broad scope of public needs. It could ask the right questions and stimulate appropriate research. It could assist the Congress in designing new or remedial legislation, and it could help define the proper role of the several agencies and jurisdictions involved.

Another way to rationalize and resolve the present complexity might be to establish a central, monolithic administrative structure. This is the case in some other countries, such as France. However, in the American tradition, given the necessary and desirable involvement of private efforts together with governmental efforts at state and local as well as Federal levels, tight centralization is not acceptable. The wisdom and prestige of a distinguished National Commission would appear far more effective in our American setting.

Let me now suggest briefly just a few of the ways in which research libraries in particular need the continuous guiding assistance of such a Commission.

Most importantly, the nation needs overall policy guidance in deciding how—with proper planning, financing, and organizing—the store of research information can be made available to all qualified users. All across the country new community colleges are being established at a great rate. And across the country there are efforts to upgrade the quality of undergraduate, often small, educational institutions, all with ambitious students and faculties. How, properly, can the capacities and expertise of the established research libraries be brought to these institutions and people, without overloading and thus reducing the quality of our greatest library and information centers? This is more than a matter of good will and more than a matter of technology. It is a subtle question of public policy involving several jurisdictions, including the independence of the universities involved.

A few years ago when I had the special privilege of being President of the 40,000-member American Library Association, I met with librarians, teachers, and friends of libraries from Alaska to Hawaii, and from Idaho to Pennsylvania. Everywhere there is a clear call for a better-organized national library and information service that will bring the best of modern services and facilities to all who need them.

Secondly, we are at a stage in history where the traditional academic faith must increasingly work together in multidisciplinary research and teaching efforts. Scientists need to work with engineers, and both groups need to work with social scientists and humanists, in dealing with vital social problems. This puts a premium on a library and information service that is a seamless web, that is not segmented, particularly in academic institutions. I have the honor to serve on the Science Information Council of the National Science Foundation which advises NSF in its research support of information science. Recently, I also served in an advisory capacity to the National Library of Medicine as it began to develop regional medical libraries under the enlightened Health Library Assistance Act of 1965. It is my opinion that while scientific and medical library

services need continued improvement, the guiding intelligence of a National Commission could assure that other intellectual needs as well are served in parallel, that there are not gaps, and that there is proper interaction and compatibility rather than fragmentation or partial development.

Thirdly, we are long since convinced that we must serve the nation and that only through wise national involvement and planning is this feasible. In 1956 we moved toward multi-county library efforts and stronger state programs. At this crucial new stage in library history we must design a national library effort that is efficient as well as imaginative, farsighted as well as practical. To do this we require a mechanism that will strengthen and focus the best efforts of all of our libraries by establishing national goals and the wherewithal to achieve them.

---

POSITION STATEMENT OF THE ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES' FEDERAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE ON THE REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES*

Since the members of the Association of Research Libraries have long been directly concerned with the Nation's library and information needs, they were heartened by the action of the President of the United States in September, 1966, in appointing the distinguished National Advisory Commission on Libraries, chaired by President Douglas M. Knight of Duke University, to survey the library needs of the Nation and to make appropriate recommendations for action. The ARL now strongly supports the basic recommendations appearing in the Commission's recent summary Report.

During the last two decades a number of powerful social, technical, economic and intellectual forces have led to a mounting need for basic improvements and changes in library and information services throughout America. The postwar involvement of the Federal Government in scientific and technical research, the rapid expansion of education at all levels, the need for better international understanding, the so-called information explosion and the potentials of technology are but some of the forces at work.

In response to these widespread needs and expectations, the Federal Government has increasingly sought ways to improve and strengthen library services for all the people. The result has been a sequence of important Federal legislation, beginning with the Library Services (and Construction) Act of 1956. Today Federal involvement, stemming from a variety of legislative acts, is the responsibility of a great number of departments and agencies throughout the governmental structure.

The Report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries defines the scope of the national need and proposes a responsible mechanism for reviewing and coordinating the present wide range of critically important Federal efforts in support of libraries, as well as for the effective planning of any future efforts which may be undertaken. Further, it will assist in coordinating these Federal efforts with those of the States, the universities, the library associations and of many other institutions and organizations.

The Association of Research Libraries agrees that the most important measure which can be undertaken, and which should be undertaken immediately, is the establishment of a distinguished, well staffed and continuing Federal review, coordinating and planning mechanism. The ARL fully supports, therefore, the Advisory Commission in its proposal that the Congress and the President establish a permanent and influential National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. This Commission, properly located within the Federal Government, could be extremely helpful in advising the President, the Congress, the Federal agencies, and the many other state and private institutions on the priorities and measures required to establish and carry out a long-term program for the improvement of library and information services.

The ARL equally supports the Advisory Commission in its recommendation that the Library of Congress, in full recognition of its generous services and potential, be officially designated and supported as the National Library of the United States and that it be provided with a distinguished public board of advisors.

---

*This position statement was adopted by the ARL membership, on January 26, 1969, as the official statement of the Association on the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries.

(2)

Similarly, the ARL endorses the Commission's recognition that there should be certain changes within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to enable the U.S. Office of Education to carry out the present and future library responsibilities assigned to it by the Congress.

The Association of Research Libraries, which consists of institutional representatives of seventy-nine major university libraries, privately established research libraries, and certain of the great Federal libraries, stands ready to assist and cooperate to the fullest in thus moving American libraries into a new era of national service.

ROBERT VOSPER, *Chairman*
WILLIAM DIX
STUART FORTH
BENJAMIN POWELL
RUTHERFORD ROGERS

---

MEMBERSHIP LIST—ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES, APRIL 1969

National *Agricultural* Library, Washington, D.C. 20250, John *Sherrod*, Director
University of *Alabama* Library, Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35486, W. Stanley *Hoole*, Librarian
University of *Arizona* Library, Tucson, Arizona 85721, Robert K. *Johnson*, Librarian
*Boston* Public Library, Boston, Massachusetts 02117, Philip J. *McNiff*, Librarian
*Boston* University Library, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, John *Laucus*, Acting Director
University of *British Columbia* Library, Vancouver 8, Canada, Basil *Stuart-Stubbs*, Librarian
*Brown* University Library, Providence, Rhode Island 02912, David A. *Jonah*, Librarian
University of *California* Library, Berkeley, California 94720, James E. *Skipper*, Librarian
University of *California* Library, Davis, California 95616, J. R. *Blanchard*, Librarian
University of *California* Library, Los Angeles, California 90024, Robert *Vosper*, Librarian
*Case Western* Reserve University Libraries, Cleveland, Ohio 44106, James V. *Jones*, Director
*Center* for Research Libraries, Chicago, Illinois 60637, Gordon R. *Williams*, Director
University of *Chicago* Library, Chicago, Illinois 60637, Herman H. Fussler, Director
University of *Cincinnati* Libraries, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221, Bruce *Kaufman*, Acting Librarian
University of *Colorado* Library, Boulder, Colorado 80304, Ralph E. *Ellsworth*, Director
*Columbia* University Libraries, New York, N.Y. 10027, Richard H. *Logsdon*, Director
The Library of *Congress*, Washington, D.C. 20540, L. Quincy *Mumford*, Librarian
University of *Connecticut* Library, Storrs, Connecticut 06268, John P. *McDonald*, Director
*Cornell* University Libraries, Ithaca, New York 14850, David *Kaser*, Director
The John *Crerar* Library, Chicago, Illinois 60616, Herman R. *Henkle*, Executive Director
*Dartmouth* College Libraries, Hanover, New Hampshire 03755, Edward C. *Lathem*, Librarian
*Duke* University Libraries, Durham, North Carolina 27706, Benjamin E. *Powell*, Librarian
University of *Florida* Libraries, Gainesville, Florida 32603, Gustave A. *Harrer*, Director
*Florida* State University Library, Tallahassee, Florida 32306, N. Orwin *Rush*, Librarian
*Georgetown* University Library, Washington, D.C. 20007, Rev. James B. *Horigan*, Director
University of *Georgia* Libraries Athens, Georgia 30601, W. P. *Kellam*, Director
*Harvard* University Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, Douglas W. *Bryant*, Librarian
University of *Illinois* Library, Urbana, Illinois 61803, Robert B. *Downs*, Dean of Library Administration

*Indiana* University Libraries, Bloomington, Indiana 47405, Robert A. *Miller*, Director
University of *Iowa* Libraries Iowa City, Iowa 52240, Leslie W. *Dunlap*, Director
*Iowa* State University Library, Ames, Iowa 50010, Warren *Kuhn*, Director
*Johns Hopkins* University Library, Baltimore, Maryland 21218, John H. *Berthel*, Librarian
*Joint* University Libraries, Nashville, Tennessee 37203, Frank P. *Grisham*, Director
University of *Kansas* Library, Lawrence, Kansas 66044, David W. *Heron*, Director
University of *Kentucky* Libraries, Lexington, Kentucky 40506, Stuart *Forth*, Director
*Linda* Hall Library, Kansas City, Missouri 64110, Joseph C. *Shipman*, Librarian
*Louisiana* State University Library, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, T. N. *McMullen*, Director
*McGill* University Library, Montreal 2, Canada, Keith *Crouch*, Director
University of *Maryland* Library, College Park, Maryland 20742, Howard *Rovelstad*, Librarian
*Massachusetts* Institute of Technology Libraries, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142, William N. *Locke*, Director
University of *Michigan* Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104, Frederick H. *Wagman*, Director
*Michigan* State University Library, East Lansing, Michigan 48823, Richard *Chapin*, Librarian
University of *Minnesota* Libraries, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455, Edward B. *Stanford*, Director
University of *Missouri* Library, Columbia, Missouri 65202, Ralph H. *Parker*, Librarian
*National* Library of Medicine, Bethesda, Maryland 20203, Martin M. *Cummings*, Director
University of *Nebraska* Libraries, Lincoln, Nebraska 68508, Frank A. *Lundy*, Director
*New York* Public Library, New York, N.Y. 10018, Edward G. *Freehafer*, Director
*New York* State Library, Albany, New York 12224, John A. *Humphry*
*New York* University Libraries, New York, N.Y. 10003, Charles F. *Gosnell*, Director
University of *North Carolina* Libraries, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27515, Jerrold *Orne*, Director
*Northwestern* University Libraries, Evanston, Illinois 60210, Thomas R. *Buckman*, Librarian
University of *Notre Dame* Libraries, South Bend, Indiana 46556, Rev. James W. *Simonson*, Director
*Ohio State* University Libraries, Columbus, Ohio 43210, Lewis C. *Branscomb*, Director
University of *Oklahoma* Library, Norman, Oklahoma 73069, Arthur M. *McAnally*, Librarian
*Oklahoma* State University Library, Stillwater, Oklahoma 74075, Roscoe *Rouse*, Librarian
University of *Oregon* Library, Eugene, Oregon 97403, Carl W. *Hintz*, Librarian
University of *Pennsylvania* Libraries, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104, Warren J. *Haas*, Director
*Pennsylvania* State University Library, University Park, Pennsylvania 19802, W. Carl *Jackson*, Director
University of *Pittsburgh* Library, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213, C. Walter *Stone*, Director
*Princeton* University Library, Princeton, New Jersey 08540, William S. *Dix*, Librarian
*Purdue* University Library, Lafayette, Indiana 47907, John H. *Moriarty*, Director
University of *Rochester* Libraries, Rochester, New York 14627, George R. *Parks*, Chief Adm. Officer
*Rutgers* University Library, New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901, Roy L. *Kidman*, Director
*St. Louis* University Library, St. Louis, Missouri 63108, Eugene P. *Kennedy*, Director
University of *Southern California* Library, Los Angeles, California 90007, Lewis F. *Stieg*, Librarian

*Southern Illinois* University Library, Carbondale, Illinois 62901, Ralph E. *McCoy*, Director
*Stanford* University Libraries, Stanford, California 94305, Rutherford D. *Rogers*, Director
*State University of New York* at Buffalo, Lockwood Library, Library Circle, Buffalo, New York 14214, Miles *Slatin*, Director
*Syracuse* University Library, Syracuse, New York 13210, Warren N. *Boes*, Director
*Temple* University Library, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122, Arthur *Hamlin*, Director
University of *Tennessee* Libraries, Knoxville, Tennessee 37916, William H. *Jesse*, Director
University of *Texas* Libraries Austin, Texas 78712, Fred *Folmer*, Librarian
*Texas A & M* University Library, College Station, Texas, James P. *Dyke*, Director
University of *Toronto* Libraries, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, Robert H. *Blackburn*, Chief Librarian
*Tulane* University Library, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118, John H. *Gribbin*, Director
University of *Utah* Library, Salt Lake City, Utah 84112, Ralph D. *Thomson*, Librarian
University of *Virginia* Libraries, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903, Ray *Frantz*, Librarian
University of *Washington* Library, Seattle, Washington 98105, Marion A. *Milczewski*, Director
*Washington* State University Library, Pullman, Washington 99163, G. Donald *Smith*, Director
*Washington* University Libraries, St. Louis, Missouri 63130, Andred J. *Eaton*, Director
*Wayne* State University Library, Detroit, Michigan 48202, G. Flint *Purdy*, Librarian
University of *Wisconsin* Libraries, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, Louis *Kaplan*, Director
*Yale* University Libraries, New Haven, Connecticut 06520, John M. *Blum*, Acting Director
University of *Massachusetts* Libraries, Amherst, Massachusetts, David *Clay*, Acting Director
University of *Alberta* Library, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, Bruce *Peel*, Director

---

Submitted by William S. Dix, Librarian, Princeton University

[From The New York Times, Mar. 18, 1969]

"1776" Reaps Fruit of Long Research

(By Lewis Funke)

Some day in Morristown, N.J., where Gen. George Washington made his headquarters in the Ford Mansion and wrote a lot of American history fighting the British, a plaque may be placed on a wall of the local library reading: "Sherman Edwards Worked Here."

It would commemorate the fact that within its quiet rooms, a 20th-century song-writer, did most of his research for a musical, "1776," depicting the men and events involved in the writing and signing of the Declaration of Independence.

The musical opened at the 46th Street Theater on Sunday night before an audience that, when the curtain came down, repeated a performance that had been going on through the preliminary previews. They rose, cheered, applauded and whistled, moved by a sense of reaffirmation emanating from the story of the nation's birth—a reaffirmation that was not achieved by sentimental flag-waving but in recognition of the shortcomings, bumblings and actual heroism of the men who fathered the country.

"I didn't have any special pleading in mind when I set out to create this show," Mr. Edwards, an ex-history teacher, remarked yesterday afternoon as he tried to relax and consume some sausage and eggs, his first food since 4 A.M. Aware that patriotism in this country appears to be old-fashioned in some quarters,

Mr. Sherman said, "I didn't set out to answer anyone. My concept simply was to show what men and events of the time with honesty and respect for reportage of the facts. I wanted to show these men at their outermost limits.

"These men were the cream of their colonies. Some were very erudite and others were simple, honest men. They were moved by self-interest, of course. But they were non-neurotic, the kind of people I've always liked. They form a diverse group. They disagreed and fought with each other. But they understood commitment, and though they fought they fought affirmatively. They didn't fight negatively and leave it at that.

"They were struggling toward a goal, though each had his own ideas of what that should be. And they came up with something, something that never was perfect. But it was as good as they could make it at the time."

Mr. Edwards, who is 49 years old, married and the father of two children, began working on his idea about seven years ago. He majored in history at New York University and did graduate work at Cornell, with his original interest being in ancient and Mediterranean history. "I gravitated to American history," he recalled, "and I was grabbed by this thing, this story of the Declaration of Independence. It excited me and I wanted to do it."

The hazel-eyed Mr. Edwards, a resident of Boonton Manor, N.J., began frequenting the library in Morristown. He had taught briefly after getting out of college, but gave that up because he also was a musician and had been working with such bandleaders as Benny Goodman, Tommy Dorsey and Louis Armstrong. Among the song hits he has written are "Wonderful, Wonderful," "See You in September," "Johnny Get Angry" and "Broken-Hearted Melody."

But the trips to the library began crowding out the music. One day Mr. Edwards went home to his wife, Ingrid, former Swiss ballet dancer and said, "We have to have a meeting." He explained that he wanted to take off two years, perhaps three, to work on his idea: doing the books and lyrics besides the music "And we could go broke," he said. There was no need for a meeting, Mr. Edwards said. He had to do what he had to do. Mr. Edwards recalls the incident with a gulp in his throat. "She's been wonderful," he said.

Also very helpful was Mrs. Marian Gearhart, the Morristown librarian, who turned over the John Adams room and everything else to get what Mr. Edwards wanted.

### PROBLEM OF ACCEPTANCE

"They were lonely hours," the composer observed, taking off his glasses, "Getting into that car and going to the library, leaving my wife and children. But I couldn't let go. I had to go through with it." He made copious notes from his reading. "With minor exceptions, he said, "everything in this show was said, these things were done."

Early rebuffs greeted Mr. Edwards after he had finished his work. "I can't mention names, some of the biggest in the theater," he said. "They looked at me and said, 'What, a costume musical?' A costume historical musical?" But Stuart Ostrow, who had produced "The Apple Tree," bought the concept for "1776." He agreed that nothing would be done to alter the aim. But he didn't like the book. Mr. Edwards agreed to call in Peter Stone, a successful screenwriter.

Mr. Stone has written the Broadway shows, "Kean" and "Skyscraper." But his real marks had been made in films, where, for example, with Frank Tarloff, he won an Oscar for "Father Goose." Mr. Stone agreed to undertake the job of rewriting the book on one condition: that there would be no cutting of the information in the musical when it began its tryouts.

"I was fascinated with the idea," Mr. Stone said yesterday. "But more than that, I was astonished at what I didn't known about American history, especially that period. I spent seven years in college. I didn't shirk history. But as Sherman told me about what went on I found myself appalled at my ignorance. Of the 56 men involved in the momentous decision I knew four or five and they were only cardboard figures. I didn't know the dates, the compromises, the sellouts. This is a national legend and it's not really taught in the schools. That's why I insisted that all the information remain.

"It's been a most rewarding experience. We're in a period of groping in this country. We're trying to find out if and where we went wrong. I think our show is going to help."

"76" VICTORY CONFIRMED BY SALES AT BOX OFFICE

The musical "1776," which opened Sunday night, had an estimated sale of $25,000 at the 46th Street Theater box office window yesterday and about five times that amount in telephone orders.

The show's advance sale was $60,000, compared with $1.3-million for another recent hit, "Promises, Promises," so there were racks full of seats for this week and on through May.

A line that numbered from 30 to 100 moved by the box office all day.

"It's the utter chaos of a smash hit," commented Edward Lynch, the theater treasurer. "We haven't had anything like this since 'How to Succeed' back in 1961."

Among the leading investors in "1776," which was capitalized at $500,000, are Edgar M. Bronfman, head of Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Inc., who put in $250,000; William J. Green, board chairman of the Clevepac Company, and CBS Records, $100,000 each, and Roger L. Stevens, former head of the National Endowment of the Arts, $10,000.

---

OKLAHOMA LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,
*May 10, 1969.*

The VICE PRESIDENT,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

SIR: The Oklahoma Library Association, in General Session April 26, adopted the following resolutions and asked that they be sent to you:

Be it resolved that the Oklahoma Library Association go on record and forward to the proper federal officials our approval of the National Library Commission and request that it be created as a permanent federal commission, believing it would be of great value to the people of the nation and a proper duty of our national government.

Be it resolved that the Oklahoma Library Association go on record and forward to the proper federal officials, the Association's commendation for past federal support of libraries at all levels; and our strong protests at the current proposed reduction in federal support to all libraries. That we believe among the best investments of federal monies is education of all our people through libraries and library services. The welfare and indeed the survival of our nation in these troubled and rapidly changing times requires the highest possible level of education and understanding by all the people in the nation. Libraries of all kinds provide information for the curious, education for the interested, inspiration to all and are a fundamental responsibility of all levels of government. The federal government should recognize clearly the importance of education through libraries and provide leadership and financial assistance for this high purpose.

Respectfully,

ANNE K. HOYT, *Secretary.*

Senator PELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and all the witnesses who were kind enough to appear. The meeting is now adjourned.

(Thereupon, at 12:15 p.m. the hearing was adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.)

○